DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 121 48 AL 001 985

By-Voegelin, C.F.; Voegelin, F.M.

Languages of the World--Native America Fascicle Two.

Indiana Univ., Bloomington.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Report No-NDEA-6-602

Pub Date Oct 65

Contract-OEC-SAE-9488

Note-154p.

Available from-Anthropology Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

Journal Cit-Anthropological Linguistics; v7 n7 Oct 1965.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80

Descriptors-*American Indian Languages, Comparative Analysis, Dialects, *Language Classification, *Language Typology

Identifiers-Central America, *Latin America, South America

This volume of the Languages of the World Series contains: "(1.5) Unified List of American Indian Languages aboriginal to Latin America" (pages 1-120), and "(1.6) Classification of American Indian languages" (North, Central, and South America, pages 121-50). For each language, language family, or other group, information is given on number of speakers, area where spoken, and linguistis involved in their classification. Major dialects are also indicated. See also ED 010 352 for Fascicle One (American Indian language North of Mexico) and ED 010 350 to ED 010 367 for other volumes in this series. (JD)

ED030121

NDEA, VI, 602
SAE 5488
PA-48
OE-BR

PART I

Anthropological Linguistics

Volume 7 Number 7

October 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD:

NATIVE AMERICA FASCICLE TWO

A Publication of the
ARCHIVES OF LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD
Anthropology Department
Indiana University

AL 001 985

ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS is designed primarily, but not exclusively, for the immediate publication of data-oriented papers for which attestation is available in the form of tape recordings on deposit in the Archives of Languages of the World. This does not imply that contributors will be restricted to scholars working in the Archives at Indiana University; in fact, one motivation for the publication of ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS is to increase the usefulness of the Archives to scholars elsewhere by making publishable data and conclusions and their tape recorded attestation more widely available. (Recorded attestation of papers from scholars elsewhere will be copied by the Archives and the original recordings returned to the collector; others may then work with the tape copy either in the Archives or elsewhere by having a copy sent to them.) In addition to heavily exemplified papers in the form of preliminary or final statements on restricted problems in phonemics, morphophonemics, morphemics, syntax and comparative grammar, ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS will include lexical lists and analyzed texts (especially in the otherwise hard-to-publish range of 20 to 100 pages) and theoretical and methodological papers (especially in the form of papers from symposia).

Each volume of ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS consists of nine numbers to be issued during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, October, November and December. Subscriptions ($3.50 a year) and papers for publication should be sent to the editor, Dr. Florence M. Voegelin, Anthropology Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter at the postoffice
at Bloomington, Indiana

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD:
NATIVE AMERICA FASCICLE TWO

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin

Indiana University

1.5. Unified list of American Indian languages aboriginal to Latin America

1.6. Classifications of American Indian languages

N.B.

Though the titles of sections 1.5 and 1.6 were given on the title page of Native America Fascicle One as they appear above, only part of 1.5 and no part of 1.6 actually appeared in Fascicle One. Under an 'N.B.' on the title page of that Fascicle, we explained: "Fascicle One, which follows, stops short of the actual list of languages aboriginal to Latin America in 1.5, below; this list, and all of 1.6 will appear in Native America Fascicle Two" — that is, in the present Fascicle.

For authorship and sponsorship, see Languages of the World: Sino-Tibetan Fascicle One (0.1). The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

1.5. [continued from Native America Fascicle One] The list of languages indigenous to Latin America now follows, under center heads for LANGUAGE ISOLATE, for LANGUAGE FAMILY, for PHYLUM (having language families and/or language isolates as constituents), and for MACRO-PHYLUM (having constituents which include at least one phylum beside another cognate language group — family, isolate, or other phylum).

A brief comment on the methodology and terminology behind this unified classification is given near the end of 1.6 (below) — after a fuller discussion of the history of the classificatory problem from the point of view of Americanist work in North America, and after a list of language families and language isolates which gives in detail the consensus reached for revising the 1944 AES [Wall] Map of North American Indian languages.

The following list, given here to conclude 1.5, might be regarded as a prolegomena to a Map of American Indian languages spoken in Latin America. No one seems actually ready to make such a map, however. The 1941 Map of North America represented one kind of consensus, and its revision represents a much fuller consensus. In contrast, the approximation of consensus on the phylum classification of the languages involved in the following list has to be stated beside alternative classifications.

Under each language family center head, we list the languages which are generally agreed to be members of that family. There is less agreement among scholars on the inclusion of these families in one phylum, and least agreement on the inclusion phyla in one macro-phylum. These cognate language groups — as family, phylum, and macro-phylum are called collectively (irrespective of the level of confidence accorded one or the other) — do not, by and large, have genetic affiliations with cognate language groups north of Mexico. An occasional cognate language group (as Penutian, Hokan and Uto-Aztecan) does have representatives to the north as well as in Latin America, not to mention Apacheans south of the Border, nor the Kickopoo group that left Oklahoma to resettle in northeast Mexico.

In the case of the Penutian phylum, we list the constituent language family and language isolate names in the next chapter (1.6, below) when they refer to languages spoken north of Mexico. But we list classificatory names as well as the languages to which they refer in this chapter (1.5, immediately below) when the Penutian constituents are located in Mexico and adjacent states.

UTO-AZTECAN FAMILY

However, in the case of the Uto-Aztecan family, we cannot so readily separate the cognate language group which includes about a score of separate languages, closely or distantly related to one another (but not remotely so). Half of these languages are spoken north of Mexico, and half in Mexico and Middle America, as appears in the single list given in Native America Fascicle One (pp. 129-32). This list includes two languages which are spoken both in Arizona and in Mexico (Pima-Papago and Yaqui-Mayo), and ten Uto-Aztecan languages which are not spoken north of Mexico — namely, Pima Bajo (Nebome), Tarahumara(Vorohio), Cora, Huichol, Tepehuan (Tepecono-

Northern Tepehuane-Southern Tepehuane), Nahuatl (Mexicano), Nahuat, Mecayapan, Pipil, and Pochutla. The last mentioned may now be extinct. If we were to add Uto-Aztecan language names definitely known to be extinct, as Opata and Cahita, or if we were to include names of dialects immediately related to one or another of the separate Uto-Aztecan languages as named here, the list would be greatly extended.

TARASCAN LANGUAGE ISOLATE

The Tarascan language is generally acknowledged to be an entirely unrelated American Indian language, in the sense in which Basque in Europe is such an isolate — i.e. as having not been successfully affiliated with any other language or family. But attempts have been made to affiliate Tarascan with Totonacan, Mayan, and Zoquean (by McQuown), and also with Zuni and Penutian (by Swadesh), as well as with Totonacan, Zoquean, and other languages in Mexico (by Swadesh). However, in the classification used here, Tarascan is listed as an unrelated isolate — that is to say, not included within any language cognate group. (The classification of Tarascan as an unrelated isolate is not to be confused with language isolates which are included within a given phylum.)

The Tarascans (Purepecha) are the principal people of the southwest portion of the Mexican State of Michoacán. They are presently confined to the highlands west from Morelia and Lake Pátzcuaro and north from Urugpan and the Paricutin Volcano. There are estimated to be from 45,000 to 60,000 people now speaking Tarascan, of whom a quarter are monolingual. Many

Tarascans go as day laborers to the United States; from most of the 120 Tarascan communities, at least one person has been to the United States.

PENUTIAN PHYLUM

As already mentioned in the prefatory paragraphs of this chapter (above), Penutian language isolate and language family names are listed in the next chapter when they refer to languages spoken north of Mexico. Here in this chapter we now name the four language families and the one language isolate that make up the Latin American half of the Penutian phylum. These are, first, the Mixe-Zoque (Zoquean) family, represented today by half dozen separate languages, as listed below; after this, the two dozen languages in the Mayan family are listed; next, mention is made of languages belonging to the Chipaya-Uru family; then two languages of the Totonacan family; and finally, a word on the language isolate, Huave, here included in the Penutian phylum (but if one were to include extinct language isolates, one would also mention Auacatecan and Tapachultecan whose affiliations are supposed to have been closer to the Mixe-Zoque than to the other families in the Penutian phylum).

This report now turns to listing the separate languages (with associated information) under each language family, without conjecturing on levels of confidence for the inclusion of one or another family or isolate in the extended Penutian — whether or not there is more evidence for including the Mixe-Zoque family than the Mayan family, for one example; and for another example, whether the evidence for relating the South American Chipaya-Uru family with the Mesoamerican Mayan family is merely suggestive (suggesting that further comparisons might be rewarding), or is already conducive to what Dell Hymes would call establishment within the Penutian phylum.

MIXE-ZOQUE (ZOQUEAN) FAMILY

The six Zoquean languages are spoken in Oaxaca, Veracruz, Chiapas and Tabasco, Mexico.

(1) Mixe (Mije, Ayook, Guichicorian) is spoken in Oaxaca, Mexico, by 32,000 speakers (1930). Mixe is generally divided into a Northern and a Southern dialect.

(2) Zoque (Soque, Tzoque, Coque, Tapijulapan, Chimalapa) is spoken in Mexico, mainly in northern Chiapas and adjacent areas of Oaxaca and Tabasco. There are over 20,000 speakers of Zoque. The main dialects are:

Copainala
Ocotopec
Ostuacan.

(3) Sierra Popoluca (Popoloca of southern Veracruz) was spoken by 10,000 people in 1930; so also

(4) Texixtepec (Tecistepec), and

(5) Sayula (Sayula Popoluca), and

(6) Oluta are all spoken in southern Veracruz, Mexico.

MAYAN FAMILY

There are about twenty-four Mayan languages, spoken by over two million speakers, located mainly in the Guatemalan highlands and southeastern Mexico including the Yucatan Peninsula. Five Mayan languages, Mam, Quiche, Cakchiquel, Kekchi and Maya each have from a quarter to a half million speakers, whereas for most of the other languages the number of speakers ranges from hundreds to tens of thousands each.

Many scholars have published classifications of the Mayan languages, beginning with Otto Stoll in 1884, followed by Kroeber in 1939, A. M. Halpern in 1942, McQuown in 1955 and again in 1956, Greenberg in 1956, Sol Tax in 1960 and, most recently, Swadesh in 1962.

McQuown's classification (which agrees almost entirely with Stoll's) is based 'in part on mapping of shared retentions, in part on an impressionistic sampling of the lexical material in the vocabularies which served as a basis for the working out of the [reconstructed] phonology' (McQuown, 1956, p. 194). The following list of Mayan languages is essentially that of McQuown.

Huastecan Group of Mayan languages

The Huastecan group includes only one language, Huasteco, which is spoken in Mexico in the northern part of Veracruz and adjoining areas of San Luis Potosi, Puebla and Hidalgo, by a total of 40,000 speakers (1930). Huasteco is geographically isolated from the rest of the Mayan languages which are spoken much further to the south.

Cholan Group of Mayan languages

(1) Chontal of Tabasco (Yocotan) is spoken in Mexico by 15,500 speakers (1940).

(2) Chol is spoken in Tabasco and Chiapas, Mexico, by 22,000 speakers (1940).

(3) Chorti is spoken in Honduras and eastern Guatemala by 33,000 speakers.

Chontal-Chol-Chorti are so closely interrelated that some investigators would consider them to be dialects of one language. Other dialects and/or languages possibly belonging to the Cholan group are Punctunc (Puctun) and Moianec (Choroti).

Tzeltalan Group of Mayan languages

(1) Tzeltal (Tseltal, Tzendal, Zendal) is spoken in eastern Chiapas, Mexico, by some 60,000 speakers (1963). Tzeltal dialects include:

Bachahom
Highland Tzeltal
Lowland Tzeltal.

(2) Tzotzil (Tzotzlem, Tzina-canteca, Chamula, Tsotsil, Totique, Querem, Quelem) is spoken in central Chiapas, Mexico, by some 35,000 speakers (1947). Four major Tzotzil dialects are:

Chamula
Huixteco
San Andres
Zincanteco.

(3) Tojolabal (Toholabal, Chaneabal, Zapaluta) is spoken in southeastern Chiapas, Mexico, by 10,000 speakers (1949). There is some evidence that Tojolabal constitutes a separate group within the Mayan family.

Chuh Group of Mayan languages

Chuh (Chuj), the sole member of this group, is spoken in western Guatemala by 10,500 speakers (1940).

Kanjobalan Group of Mayan languages

(1) Jacaltec is spoken by 12,000 people in western Guatemala.

(2) Kanjobal (Kanhobal, Conob), and

(3) Solomec, also spoken in western Guatemala, combined, have some 40,000 speakers. Kanjobal and Solomec may be dialects of one language rather than separate languages.

Motozintlec Group of Mayan languages

Motozintleco, the only member of this group, is spoken in Motozintleca, Chiapas, Mexico, by over 1,000 speakers (1940).

Mamean Group of Mayan languages

(1) Mam (Mame, Zaklohpacap) is spoken in western Guatemala (268,000 speakers, 1940) and southern Chiapas, Mexico (16,500 speakers, 1940) by a combined total of 284,500 speakers (1940).

(2) Aguacatec is spoken by 7,000 people in Guatemala (1956). There are two dialects:

Aguacatan
Chalchitan.

(3) Ixil of west central Guatemala, has 15,000 speakers (1940).

The following may be additional languages or dialects of the Mamean Group:

Tacaneco

Tlatiman

Taquial

Tupancal

Tutuapa

Coyotin.

Quichean Group of Mayan languages

(all spoken in Guatemala)

(1) Quiche (Kiché, Utlatec) is spoken by 450,000 people (1940). Uspantec, listed as a separate language in many classifications, is a dialect of Quiche.

(2) Cakchiquel (Cachiquel) is spoken by 329,000 speakers (1940).

(3) Tzutujil (Tzutuhil, Zutujil) has 24,000 speakers (1940).

(4) Rabinal (Achi).

Kekchian Group of Mayan languages

(1) Kekchi (Quekchi, Cacchi) is spoken by nearly 250,000 people (1940) in Guatemala, and by an additional 650 in British Honduras.

(2) Pokonchi (Pocomchi), and

(3) Pokomam (Pocomam) are spoken mainly in Guatemala by 25,000 and 17,000 speakers, respectively.

Maya proper Group of Mayan languages

Maya is the sole member of this group. It is spoken mainly in the Yucatan Peninsula by about 300,000 people. The main dialects are:

Yucatec

Itza

Lacandone

Mopan; the Lacandone and Mopan dialects are spoken by a few hundred speakers each.

CHIPAYA-URU FAMILY

Ronald D. Olson has recently marshalled evidence from which he postulates a genetic connection between Mayan and two Bolivian languages, thereby including within the Penutian phylum a South American language family — here called Chipaya-Uru, after the two separate languages in the family which have, so far, been specified. The speakers of both Chipaya and Uru are strongly influenced by their Aymara neighbors who surround them entirely. Uru is in fact being replaced by Aymara. Nineteen percent of the Chipaya lexicon consists of Aymara loans; there are also many Quechua and Spanish loans in Chipaya.

(1) Chipaya is spoken on the southern end of the Bolivian Altiplano by 800 speakers.

(2) Uru is spoken in the vicinity of the two lakes, Titicaca and Poopo, by possibly as few as 100 speakers. The Uru dialect spoken on the Isla del Sol in Lake Titicaca is divergent.

TOTOṆACAN FAMILY

(1) Totonac (Totonaco) is spoken in the Mexican states of Veracruz and Puebla by more than 90,000 people, of whom 65 percent were monolingual in 1930. Three major dialects have centers in the areas of Zacatlan, Papantla, Pantepec; these three dialects are said to be in part mutually intelligible,

but not wholly so. Additional names associated with Totonaco are Chacahuaxtli, Ipapana, Tatiquilkati and Tatimolo.

(2) Tepehua (Acalman) is spoken by 3,000 people (1930), living in Veracruz and Hidalgo, Mexico.

HUAVE LANGUAGE ISOLATE

Huave, as a language, had 4,000 speakers in 1930, living in a coastal area of eastern Oaxaca, Mexico. Huave, as a language isolate within the Penutian phylum, is in controversy. For example, Swadesh favors a reclassification such that Huave would remain a language isolate, but one within another phylum than the Penutian phylum (see Oto-Manguean phylum below; in the proposed reclassification, Huave would be added but Manguean subtracted).

HOKAN PHYLUM

In unanimous agreement, the 1964 Conference on the Classification of American Indian Languages held that Sapir's old Hokan-Siouan macro-phylum was too inclusive; that a better perspective would be obtained by classifying as a phylum rather than as a macro-phylum those language isolates and families of the United States, Mexico, and Mesoamerica which Sapir and subsequent workers affiliated in the Hokan part of the larger macro-phylum. Accordingly, two language families (Tequistlatecan and Tlapanacan) and two language isolates (Seri and Jicaque) are now classified as the Latin American constituents of the Hokan phylum, not to mention additional names of language isolates and families which are now extinct (e.g. the Salinan family and the Coahuiltecan isolate — both of Mexico — which are supposed to have shown certain affiliations within the Hokan phylum , while the Guaycuran family of Mexico and the Yurumangui isolate of west coast Colombia are regarded as having been less certainly affiliated in the Hokan phylum).

SERI LANGUAGE ISOLATE

Seri (Ceri, Zeri, Heri, Kunkaak, Kmike, Tiburon), is now spoken on the Tiburon Island by relatively few people, though it was formerly also spoken in the adjacent parts of Sonora in coastal northwestern Mexico. In respect to other members of the Hokan phylum, Seri is most closely related to the Yuman family, as noted in the Hokan list under 1.6, below.

TEQUISTLATECAN FAMILY

Tequistlateca (Chontol of Oaxaca, Tlequistlateco) is spoken in southern Oaxaca, Mexico, by 8,000 or 9,000 people. There are two groups of Tequistlatecan speakers, a coastal group (Tluamelula) and a mountain group, the differences between which may be sufficient to regard Tequistlateca as a family of two languages, rather than as two dialects of one language. We follow Viola Waterhouse in classifying Tequistlatcan as two languages:

(1) Tluamelula

(2) Mountain Tlequistlateco.

The Tequistlatecan family appears to be most closely related to Seri and Yuman, among the other constituents of the Hokan phylum.

TLAPANCAN (SUBTIABA-TLAPANEC, SUPANECAN) FAMILY

(1) Tlapanec (Tiapaneco, Tlappanec) is the only extant representative of this family. It is spoken in Guerrero, Mexico, by about 14,000 monolinguals

(1940); about 16,000 (including bilinguals) were enumerated in the 1930 census.

The relationship between Subtiaba (formerly spoken in Nicaragua) and Tlapanec was so close as to clearly make them members of the same family. The family may also have included the extinct Maribichicoa, formerly spoken in El Salvador, and more dubiously, Yopi, formerly spoken in Mexico.

JICAQUE LANGUAGE ISOLATE

Jicaque (Xicaque, Cicaque, Hicaque, Ikake, Taguaca, Torrupan, Tauhca) is spoken in Honduras. There are four dialects:

Jicaque

Yoro

Palmar (Sula)

Lean y Mulia.

OTO-MANGUEAN PHYLUM

The phylum as given above is known also by alternate names — the Oto-Manguean (Macro-Otomanguean, Olmeca-Otomangue) phylum — and is known to include six language families in one cognate language group. Since the constituents are language families, and since no language phylum is included among the constituents, the cognate language group as a whole fits into our classification as a phylum (rather than as a macro-phylum) — Oto-Manguean (rather than Macro-Otomanguean) — whose constituent language families are Manguean (Chorotegan), Otomian (Otomi-Pame), Popolocan, Mixtecan, Chinantecan and Zapotecan.

More comparative work has been done both within and between the families of the Oto-Manguean phylum than between the constituents of any other phylum in Latin America — notably by Newman, Weitlaner, Fernandez de Miranda, Swadesh, Arana, Hamp, Longacre, and Gudschinsky. Alternatives in the subgrouping of some languages (e.g., Trique and Amusgo) have been argued, but the composition of the phylum as a whole is generally agreed upon. This inclusion in one cognate language group of six language families represents a greater degree of reliability — and perhaps a closer degree of relationship — than the inclusions in any other Latin American phyla.

Gudschinsky (IUPAL 15, 1959) demonstrated the relationship of the Popolocan and Mixtecan families by her reconstruction of Proto-Popotecan (a portmanteau name — derived from Popoloc plus Mixtecan — used instead of the earlier Olmecan, which was confusing because of its application to a culture known only archaeologically). However, as Longacre (IJAL 27.22, 1961) points out, the demonstration of the relationship between the Mixtecan and Popolocan families does not prove "that these two language families are properly grouped together genetically as opposed to other Oto-Manguean languages ... the possibility still remains that other languages, say Zapotecan, Otomi-Pame, Chinantecan, Manguean, or some combination of these may prove to tie into Popolocan and Mixtecan as closely as these two ... relate to each other."

MANGUEAN (CHOROTEGAN) FAMILY

Both languages of the Manguean family are said to be extinct, though Chiapaneco was spoken as recently as 1942. Some of the names of dialects of the Mangue language, as Chorotega, Diria and Orotina, have been applied to the family as a whole, or to the language Mangue, as well as to particular dialects of Mangue

(1) Mangue was formerly spoken in Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Honduras in a number of dialects: Mangue, Diria and Nagrandan in Nicaragua; Orisi, Orotinya (Orotina), and Nicoya in Costa Rica; Choluteca (Chorotega) in Honduras.

(2) Chiapaneco was spoken in Mexico.

OTOMIAN (OTOMI-PAME) FAMILY

The languages of this family bear resemblances which permit their classification into a pair of languages for each of three branches: Otomi and Masahua (central branch); Ocuiltec and Matlatzinca (southern branch); Chichameca-Jonaz and Pame (northern branch). These six Otomian languages are spoken over a large area in southern Mexico. Otomi proper has nearly a quarter of a million speakers, contrasting sharply with, say, Chichimeca-Jonaz which has only 800 speakers.

(1) Otomi (Othomi) is spoken in the Mexican states of Hidalgo, México, Querétaro, Veracruz, Puebla, Guanajuato and to a small extent in other areas. The total number of speakers in over 215,000 (1930). Four dialect areas are distinguished on geographic and linguistic grounds:

(a) Northwestern (Mezquital), covering the largest area and including the greatest number of speakers, living on the central plateau in Hildago and in the adjacent states of Mexico and Querétaro;

(b) Northeastern (Sierra) dialect, spoken in the border area of Hidalgo, Veracruz and Puebla;

(c) Southwestern dialect, spoken in the northern part of the state of Mexico (the most diversified Otomi area);

(d) Ixtenco, an isolated dialect in the state of Tlaxcala.

(2) Mazahua is spoken in the Mexican states of México and Michoacán by 80,000 people (1940).

(3) Ocuiltec (Ocuilteca, Ocuilteco, Atzinca) is spoken in the Mexican state of México, in the San Juan Acingo area. The number of speakers is apparently very small.

(4) Matlatzinca (Pirinda) has less than 2,000 speakers (1940) living in the Mexican state of México.

(5) Chichimeca-Jonaz (Chichimeco, Meco, Jonaz, Chichemeca) is still spoken in Guanajuato, Mexico, by 800 people (1956).

(6) Pame is spoken in the states of San Luís Potosí and Hidalgo, Mexico, by over 1,500 people (1930).

POPOLOCAN FAMILY

The Popolocan (Mazatecan, Olmecan) family consists of two branches: Popoloca, Chocho and Ixcateco form a Popoloc branch, and Mazatec another branch.

(1) Popoloc (Popoloca) is spoken in Puebla and Oaxaca, Mexico, by 10,000 people (1930).

(2) Chocho (Chuchon, Chucholtec, Chuchotec) is spoken by 600 people (1930) in Oaxaca.

(3) Ixcateco is spoken in the Santa María Ixcatlán area of Oaxaca.

(4) Mazateco is spoken in Oaxaca and Puebla, Mexico, by about 85,000 people. The dialects of Mazateco include: Huautla de Jimenez, San Jeronimo Tecoatl, Mazatlan de Flores, San Miguel Soyaltepec, Anawtla.

MIXTECAN FAMILY

The Mixtecan family includes four languages, as listed below. Longacre (RCPAFL 5, 1957; AL 3.1-44, IJAL 27.9-29) demonstrated a closer relationship between the first three than between any of these and Amuzgo — i.e. Amuzgo diverged from the rest of the family before the other languages were differentiated. Hence alternate names, as Macro-Mixtecan and Amuzgo-Mixtecan, have been used for the family as a whole — Mixtecan thus being applied to the group Mixtec, Cuicatec and Trique. (Before Longacre's demonstration of the position of Trique in the Mixtecan family, the name Mixtecan had also been applied to the combination Mixtec plus Cuicatec plus Amuzgo.)

(1) Mixtec (Mixteco) is spoken in Oaxaca, Guerrero and Puebla, Mexico, by 170,000 people (1930). Mixtec dialects include: Cuilapa, Cuixtlahuac, Mictlantongo, Montanyes, Nochiztlan, Tamazulaxa, Tepuzculano, Tlaxiaco, Xaltepec, and Yanhuitlan.

(2) Trique (Trike) is spoken in Oaxaca by 3,000 people (1930).

(3) Cuicateco is spoken by 10,000 people (1946) living in northeastern Oaxaca.

(4) Amuzgo (Amusgo) is spoken in Guerrero and Oaxaca by 8,000 people (1930).

CHINANTECAN FAMILY

Chinantec (Chinanteco), usually treated as one language spoken in numerous dialects in northern Oaxaca by 25,000 people, is said by Frank E. Robbins (IJAL 27.237-8, 1961) to comprise as many as six sets of mutually unintelligible dialects — hence six separate languages — not as yet delineated. Chinantec dialects include: Quiotepec (as part of a Highland complex of mutually intelligible dialects), with 3,000 speakers in the District of Ixtlán; other dialect or language names are Huahmi; Hume; Palantla; Ojitlan; Yolox; Chiltepec; Lalana; Usila.

ZAPOTECAN FAMILY

The two languages listed below comprise the Zapotecan family.

(1) Zapotec (Zapoteco) is spoken mainly in Oaxaca, Mexico, by over 200,000 people (1930). Zapotec dialects are divided into three or four groups which differ so much from each other that Swadesh (IJAL 13.220, 1947) says, 'the main divisions of Zapotec are actually divergent enough to be classed as separate languages'; this conflicts with the de Angulo and Freeland (IJAL 8.15, 1933) report: "The man from the Valleys is unable to understand a running conversation between two mountaineers, although if they address him and speak slowly and carefully, the root-words are so similar to those of his own speech that he can understand the drift of their message quite readily." Because of this statement of partial intelligibility (and other statements on the similarity of subdialects across dialect borders), we list Zapotec here as a single language. The main divisions of Zapotec dialects are:

(a) Southern Mountain (Miahuatlan, Miahuateco), including such pueblos as Miahuatlan, Cuixtla, the Coatlanes, and the Mixtepecs;
(b) Valleys (Valley-Isthmus, Central), including such pueblos as Mitla, Teotitlan del Valle, Tule, Ejutla, Ocotlan, Zaachila, and Tehuantepec;
(c) Northern Mountain, with two subdialect areas more sharply differentiated than the subdialects of the other dialects: Sierra de Juarez (Ixtlan, Serrano), including such pueblos as Ixtlan, Ixtepexi, Macultanguis and Xaltianguis; and Sierra de Villa Alta (Yalálag, Rincón), including such pueblos as Yalálag, Yatzachi el Bajo, Cajonos, Cuajimoloyas and Laxopa.

(2) Chatino is spoken in southwestern Oaxaca, Mexico, by 12,000 speakers (1930).

Mexican and Mesoamerican Phyla
vs.
South American Macro-phyla

Aside from an unaffiliated language isolate (Tarascan), and aside from a language family (Uto-Aztecan) that extends over western North America from the Canadian border through the United States and through Mexico deep into Mesoamerica, the Mexican-Mesoamerican linguistic perspective can be summarized in terms of three phyla whose constituents are language families, or include language isolates beside language families. Two of these three phyla (Penutian and Hokan) show greater diversification north of Mexico than in Mexico-Mesoamerica. The third phylum — Oto-Manguean — has its diversification necessarily centered south of the border, since all its known languages are spoken exclusively in Mexico or Mesoamerica. In addition to the three phyla mentioned, a number of constituents of one phylum that is centered in South America (Macro-Chibchan) are also found in Mesoamerica.

The South American linguistic perspective, aside from numerous unclassified languages, can also be summarized in terms of three major cognate language groups — macro-phyla (in the case of the South American cognate language groups) in contrast to more modest phyla (in the case of Mexico - Mesoamerica).

Before preceding to the discussion of South American macro-phyla, a word must be said about the rather different referents that the term 'macro' bears in the relevant linguistic literature, and a word of warning about terminological usage proposed in the related ethnographic literature.

As already mentioned, a phylum is distinguished from a macro-phylum in consequence of a specific complexity among constituents found only in the latter. The simpler 'phylum' is a cover-term for a cognate language group which consists essentially of two or more language families, while 'macro-phylum' is a cover-term for a cognate language group which consists of one phylum or more than one beside one language family or more than one (cp. now 1.6, below, for the relevance of 'language isolate' in phylum linguistics both to the simpler 'phyla', as in Mexico-Mesoamerica, and to the more complex macro-phyla, as in South America). This distinction between the single label and the compound label holds when the specific language name precedes the label, as in 'Penutian phylum'. But when the label 'macro' precedes the specific language name, something else is meant. Thus, what was meant by Macro-Mixtecan, as explained above, was merely that the family as a whole was designated, including the rather divergent Amuzgo language; before Amuzgo was included, the Mixtecan family was known to consist of Mixtec and two or three other closely related languages — but sometimes also to include Amuzgo (hence this particular usage of 'macro' does not serve to resolve ambiguities). Another usage of 'macro' before a specific language name does help to avoid ambiguity: it indicates that the relationship among the constituents is one of phylum linguistic proportions. Thus, in Native America Fascicle One, we use the labels 'Siouan' and 'Algonquian' in reference to two language families in the Bloomfieldian sense of language family; we use the term 'Macro-Siouan' in reference to a phylum which includes the Siouan family among its constituents, beside a couple of other language families and beside a couple of language isolates; and we use the term 'Macro-Algonquian' in reference to a phylum which includes Algonquian and one other language family, as well as a half dozen language isolates, such as the Yurok and Wiyot languages in California which Sapir made famous.

Our word of warning in general about an occasional ethnographer's terminological usage is more vivid if the reference is made specific; here we refer to Julian H. Steward and Louis C. Faron, Native Peoples of South America (N.Y. 1959, pp. 25, 26): "Linguists have used the terms 'family', 'stock', 'phylum', and 'phylum group' for their major divisions. In the present volume, we have designated the major divisions as families, subdivisions of families as subfamilies, and subdivisions of these as groups ... the divisions are not necessarily comparable since a fixed quantity or degree of relationship can never be stated." Switching of labels in English technical terminology is of course as possible as switching of languages in scientific discourse. It is as possible to talk about meteorology in German as it is in English — if, and only if, participants in the dialogue both understand meteorology; the difficulty in talking about what makes it rain in Hopi is that the Hopi theory about Kachinas precludes meteorological discussion. All a Hopi needs to know is that the Kachinas make it rain; all an innocent ethnographer needs to know is that Sapir reduced the number of families in North America from a half hundred to a half dozen, and that Greenberg brought about a parallel reduction in South America, as Steward and Faron say (p. 25): "While Greenberg's classification is provisional in certain respects, it is an expectable reduction of what was obviously a greatly excessive number of families [in descending order, 94 families named by Cestmir Loukotka, 84 by Alexandar Chamberlain, 74 by Paul Rivet, 65 by J. Alden Mason, 60 by Daniel G. Brinton, and 4 by Joseph Greenberg]." Compare this confusing comparison of 'major divisions' in South America with Dyen's use of terms for 'major divisions' in Oceania (A Lexicostatistic Classification of the Austronesian Languages, Memoir 19 of IJAL 30: 1.1-64, 1965); to paraphrase the first sentence cited above, major divisions are necessarily comparable (for Dyen, but not for Steward and Faron) since a fixed quantity or degree of relationship can be stated lexicostatistically (by Dyen, but not by Steward and Faron). The methodological problem at issue is discussed in the chapter after this (1.6, below).

Here we mention in passing that the same methods which are able to detect remote relationships in phylum linguistics and to throw light on the interrelationships among language families (which remain language families, of course) — so that larger but fewer 'major divisions' emerge (three phyla for Mexico and Mesoamerica, and three macro-phyla for South America) — need not stop short of the linguistic unity of all human languages. While Greenberg goes far, but not all the way, in postulating a single cognate language group for American Indian languages in both continents, Swadesh goes all the way — and even beyond the New World: "I am in agreement with Greenberg's conception of ultimate relatedness of all the languages, except that I would now go farther and include Na-Dene and Eskimoan, and also languages of the Old World (see Swadesh 1962)." (Current Anthropology 4.318, 1963).

SOUTH AMERICAN MACRO-PHYLA

Beside North American phyla numbered I to VII in our final classification (1.6) there is, north of Mexico, a group of unaffiliated language families and language isolates numbered VIII; and the phylum distributed exclusively in Mexico-Mesoamerica (Oto-Manguean) is numbered IX. Consecutive numbering is followed for the macro-phyla of South America. Beside the macro-phyla numbered X (Macro-Chibchan) and XI (Ge-Pano-Carib Macro-phylum) and XII (Andean-Equatorial Macro-phylum), there is a group of unaffiliated language families and language isolates in South America that is numbered XIII.

Little or no attempt is made here to relate this classification to the classifications reflected in older linguistic wall maps of South America, such as Wigberto Jimenez Moreno's 1936 Mapa Linguistico de Sudamerica (after Krickeberg). Nor does the classification which follows attempt a detailed unification of the sources which it cites; as already mentioned, it would seem premature to attempt a new linguistic map of South America because so many of the relationships turn out to be alternative or indeterminate.

MACRO-CHIBCHAN PHYLUM X

Macro-Chibchan is one of the largest and most widespread of the South American phyla, centering in Colombia and extending northward (as far as Guatemala), as well as southward and eastward (into Ecuador, Peru, Brazil and Venezuela). The numerous languages which are included in the phylum — particularly in the Chibcha proper subdivision — have been sub-grouped in a number of crisscrossing ways. We here follow the latest overall subgrouping available to us, that of Greenberg in the Fifth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960); but we add to Greenberg's lists of languages in particular subgroups some other names attributed to these same subgroups by earlier sources — particularly by Mason and McQuown.

Greenberg divides the Macro-Chibchan phylum into two groups or microphyla, (A) and (B). The (A) group, Chibcha proper, consists of three subgroups: (1) Chibchan, for which classificatory evidence is indeterminate so far —

Chibchan may be a family or phylum; (2) the Misumalpan family plus the language isolates Paya, Xinca and Lenca; (3) the Waican family. The (B) group called Paezan consists of the Barbacoan family, the Choco family, the Yunca-Puruhan phylum, the Jirajaran family, and a number of language isolates as Warao and Muran.

Chibcha Family or Phylum

Relationships among the languages listed below as Eastern Chibchan leave no doubt as to their membership in one family; less certainly, the relationships between these and languages of the other subgroups listed below under Chibchan may also be closely enough related to be in the same family. They are more closely related to each other than to languages of other families in the macro-phylum (as Choco), except possibly the Barbacoan and the Inter-Andine families, which are included in this Chibcha (1) classification by most other scholars — but not by Greenberg.

Eastern Chibchan consists of three subgroups — Cundinamarcan, Aruaco, Central American — which are sometimes termed collectively Chibcha Proper (a term also used for the larger micro-phylum):

The Cundinamarcan subgroup (after the name of the Colombian department), includes the following languages, all of which are probably extinct: (1) Chibcha (Muisca, Mosca) became extinct in the eighteenth century; it was the language of the Chibcha nation, which once had a population of almost a million in the central highlands of Colombia; other extinct, and largely unknown tribes in the area, such as the Agata, are also assumed to have spoken

Chibcha.

(2) Duit was perhaps most closely related to (1), above.

(3) Tunebo (Tame), and a dialect of this language called Pedrazá,

(4) Morcote

(5) Sinsiga.

The Aruaco (Arhuacoa, Arhuacan, Cagaba-Arhuaco) subgroup includes languages also found in Colombia, of which (6), (7), and (8) following are not marked as extinct by McQuown:

(6) Bintucua

(7) Cagaba (Kaggaba)

(8) Ica.

Atanque (Atankez), Guamaca and Sanha — all extinct — presumably also belonged to the Aruaco subgroup.

The Central American subgroup:

(10) Rama, spoken in Nicaragua, and a dialect of this language called Melchora.

Languages (11) and (12) and the Talamanca group, below, have been grouped as Western Chibchan:

(11) Guatuso, including the extinct dialect Corobici, spoken in northern Costa Rica by 150 people, is perhaps most closely related to (10), above; the extinct Gotane of Costa Rica and Cocora (Cocori) of Nicaragua have also been classified as Guatuso-speaking, but the Cocora may rather have been a sub-tribe of the Suerre, listed below, (18).

(12) Cuna, spoken on the San Blas Islands of Panama, as well as on the main-

land of Panama and Colombia, by 21,000 people, is said to consist of the present day San Blas and a Chucuna (mainland) dialect; the Cueva dialect, formerly also spoken on the mainland, is now extinct. The San Blas dialect includes such subgroups (possibly speaking different subdialects) as the Paya.

The Talamanca group includes languages spoken mostly in southern Costa Rica and northern Panama:

(13) Bribri (Valiente) is spoken by 2,000 people of whom twenty percent are bilingual in Spanish. Talamanca, Valiente, Viceita, Urinama, Tariaca, Estrella and Pocosi are probably present or former dialects of Bribri.

(14) Terraba (Tiribi, Tirribi, Nortenyo, Quequexque), spoken by 700 people, probably includes or formerly included the following dialects: Tojar, Techbi (Teshbi), Depso, Lari, Ara, Uren, and Zhorquin (Zorquin, Yurquin).

(15) Boruca (Brunca), including such extinct dialects as Burucaca, Coto, Kepo (Quepo) and Turucaca

(16) Cabecar (Chiripo) - Corrhue (Xorrhue)

(17) Tucurrike (Tucurrique) - Orisa

(18) Suerre (Turricia)

(19) Guetar and (20) Voto are extinct.

A Pacific Chibchan group, recognized by some sources, would include the Guaymi-Dorasque (Isthmian) group, the languages of which are or were spoken in northern Panama:

(21) Guaymi, includes a number of dialects, or possibly closely related languages, such as Murire (Bukueta-Sabanero), reported by missionaries to have

10,000 speakers, and Move (Valiente, Nortenyo), reported to have 15,000 speakers; and Muite, Muoi, and Penonomenyo, all reportedly extinct. (Escoria and Nata, sometimes listed as Guaymi dialects, were Panamanian towns named after their principle chiefs by the Spaniards who encountered them in the early 16th century; nothing is known of their language except the statement that mutually unintelligible languages were spoken in the area.)

(22) Dorasque (Dorasco, Torresque) proper, including some of its subdivisions as Chiriluo (Chiru), is extinct, as are some of the closely related languages or dialects, such as Changuena (Changina, after which the group of dialects listed here under (22) is sometimes called); but Chaliva, a sister dialect of Changuena (Changina), is not extinct. Some of the other Dorasque dialects or closely related languages are also not extinct, as Burica spoken in Costa Rica and across the border into Panama by 700 people, and as Duy and Chumula (Chumulu, Chumulue).

The other (Colombian) Pacific Chibchan languages might also be grouped with Guaymi-Dorasque: Aburra, Jamundi, Lile, Timba and Yameci are known to be extinct, leaving the only apparently extant member to be

(23) Yolo.

Misumalpan Family

Misumalpan has been assumed to be a phylum (stock) partly on the basis of the fact that its three major components — Miskito, Sumo, Matagalpa — have been called families or stocks. We list Misumalpan as a family on the basis of the fact that Miskito and Sumo each appear to be single languages —

closely related to each other — and Matagalpa, though often said to be more distantly related, is classified by Swadesh (1957), on the basis of glottochronology, as being as closely related to Miskito and to Sumo as the latter are to each other. Matagalpa is still spoken; it appears to be a single language, though Swadesh lists a divergence time within Matagalpa of 1000 years, perhaps by the inclusion of comparisons with a so-called Matagalpa dialect which may have been affiliated with one of the other languages in the family or have represented a fourth Misumalpan language. The three languages of the Misumalpan family are, accordingly, Miskito, Sumo, and Matagalpa:

(1) Miskito (Misquito, Mosquito, Mosco) is spoken in the lowlands of Nicaragua and Honduras, from Pearl Lagoon in the south to the Black River in the northwest, in three major dialects: Tawira (Tauira), spoken from Pearl Lagoon to Bemuna (thus perhaps including the group labelled Baymuna (Baymunana, Baldam) in McQuown); Wanki (Wangki), spoken on the Wangks River; and Honduran Miskito (Mam). The remaining name listed as Miskito by Mason and McQuown — Cabo (Kabo, said to be the dialect used by missionaries) — probably represents the name of a geographically restricted group of Miskito speakers.

(2) Sumo (Sumu) is spoken from northeastern Nicaragua into the central highlands in two major dialects:

(a) Northern Sumo, spoken by the Twahka (Twahca, Tauahca, Taguaca) and the Panamaka (Panamaca) tribes, includes the incorporated remnants of the Bawihka (Bawahca, Bauihca), with only slight differences in dialect reported between the two tribes. The dialects spoken by the now probably extinct Prinsu (Prinzo), Silam and Ku may have also belonged to this northern dialect group. Of the other names listed in the literature as Sumo, Mason designates four — Coco, Lacu, Wasabane (Huasabane) and Pispi — as subgroups of the Twahka, with Tunki (Tungui) and Carawala (Carahuala) designated as subgroups of the Panamaka.

(b) The southern Sumo dialect is probably now spoken only by the Ulva (Ulua, Ulwa, Ohlwa, Wulwa) 'whose language differs from the northern Sumu almost [only] as much as Dutch from German' (IJAL 16.31-2, 1950). Other probably southern dialects, said to have practically disappeared (1950), include those of the Yusku (Yosko), Boa and Kukra (Cucra). The speech of the Musutepes and Yasica remains unassigned to a particular dialect.

(3) Matagalpa is spoken in the central highlands of Nicaragua, especially in the Matagalpa Department, extending across the border into Honduras. Cacaopera, described by Lehmann as spoken by a remnant of a tribe in El Salvador, is listed by Mason as a dialect of Matagalpa, but assumed by Heath to be a dialect of Sumo.

Other names listed by McQuown as probably extinct and unclassified Misumalpan may represent names for geographically restricted groups, each of which spoke one of the three languages above. Thus, Bambana may be a label for speakers of the northern Sumo dialect who live on the Banbana River.

Paya Language Isolate

Paya (Seco, Taia, Towka) is spoken in northern Honduras.

Xinca Language Isolate

Xinca (Jinca, Sinca, Ikomagi, Popoloco) is spoken in southeastern Guatemala.

Lenca Language Isolate

Lenca is spoken in southwestern Honduras and adjacent El Salvador. The status of separate dialects is sometimes ascribed to the names of various Lenca villages, as Guajiquiro (Guaxiquero).

Waican Family

Languages of the Waican (Uaican, Guaican, Waikan, Shirianan, Chirianan, Guahariban) family are spoken in a compact area on the Brazilian-Venezuelan border centering around 3° north latitude and 64° west longitude in the Parima mountain range.

Though the number of Waican groups maintaining separate tribal identities is fairly high, the degree of mutual intelligibility among them is such that the Waican family may consist of only two languages — or may even be a single language isolate (Borgman, et. al., The Waican Languages, in press, Anthropological Linguistics, in which Waican is chosen as the name of the family on the basis of its use by native speakers to identify all other groups speaking related dialects).

(1) Shirishana (Shirishiana), spoken by a small group isolated on the Mucajaí River, is said to be mutually unintelligible with other Waican dialects, but the period for which the Shirishana are said to have been out of contact with other Waican dialects — twenty years — is so brief that loss of intelli-

gibility with all other dialects could hardly have taken place during that period. Perhaps the Shirishana already spoke a separate language before they lost contact. Perhaps the dialect area from which they lost contact was not the same one with which contact was re-established; then the chain of mutual intelligibility may have been broken by their appearance at another point in the chain.

(2) The second language in the Waican family, which might be designated Waica, consists of four main dialect groups, each of which is further divisible into smaller geographic areas or tribes, the dialectal differences between which are said to be minor. The greater number of subgroups (communities) named under the first dialect listed below reflects more intensive contact with the people in the area, rather than greater diversity within that dialect.

(a) The most extensive Waica dialect area is that encompassing the group of entirely mutually intelligible dialects of Shamatari (largely in the state of Amazonas in Venezuela, where the speakers are called Guaica) and of Central Waica (largely in the state of Rio Branco in Brazil). Central Waica has three major divisions: Waica proper, Parahuri, and Maita (Mayta), which includes Maracana. Other local divisions of Central Waica include: Parimiteri, Marashiteri, and Aykamteri (Aikamteri), which in turn includes: Ty̌hy̌napteri (Tühinapteri), Rokoteri, Wy̌tehayter (Witehayteri), Arakayteri, Shiteuteri and Mayupteri (-teri is a suffix meaning people affixed to geographic designations to mean people of that place). A figure of 15,000 for the number of Waica speakers probably combines the number of speakers of this dialect with those of the dialect labelled (c) below.

(b) The second Waica dialect area is that of the Shiriana, largely in the Venezuelan state of Bolivar, of which there are about 200 speakers. One Shiriana local division is called Parawateri (Parauana, Parahuana, Parauien). The Shiriana dialect is said to be 'not too divergent' from the Shamateri-Central Waica dialect.

(c) The Southern Waica dialect, spoken in Amazonas and Rio Branco, Brazil, is said to be more divergent from Shamateri-Central Waica than is Shiriana.

(d) The Samatari dialect is even more divergent — so much so that it is said to be 'mutually unintelligible with many if not most' [but not all] dialects of Central Waica. Samatari (also sometimes called Shiriana) is spoken west of Shiriana, largely in the Venezuelan state of Bolivar. Subgroups of Samatari include the Mitiwari (Mitiwariteri) and Guaharibo (Guajaribo), both living in the region of the headwaters of the Caura River. A figure of 10,000 for the Guaharibo population probably includes all the other Samatari.

Names of other Waican local groups, not identified as to dialect, include Zirizan and Tocoshina in Brazil; and in Venezuela they include Yanomani, Kadimani and Shidishana (an alternative spelling of Shirishana, above, but possibly a different group since differently localized).

Two other names are listed by McQuown and others following him each as separate units of Waican (Chirianan) co-ordinate with the group of two languages listed above. However, since the locations given for them are in the very center of the Waican area — the area of least dialect diversity —

it seems likely that they represent neither separate branches of the Waican family nor even separate languages within the family; they seem to be just (alternate) names for dialects of (or tribes who speak) Waica. The two additional names in question are Carime (Xauari) and Pusaracau.

Barbacoan Family

The relationship between the Barbacoan group of languages, considered a separate family (stock) by Brinton, and the languages of the Chibchan family has been variously viewed. Generally, the relationship has been recognized by including Barbacoan within a (Western) branch of the Chibchan family (e.g. by Jijón y Caamaño). A more specific relationship between this Barbacoan group and an Inter-Andine (Paez-Coconuco) group has been recognized in more than one way. In one kind of recognition, the Inter-Andine languages are added to the Western branch of the Chibchan family (e.g. by Hernández de Alba). While Greenberg also recognizes a close relationship between Inter-Andine and Barbacoan, he nevertheless asserts a remoter relationship between both groups and the Chibchan languages listed above, excluding Barbacoan and Inter-Andine not only from the Chibchan family but also from his Chibcha Proper subdivision of the Macro-Chibchan phylum; he places them in his Paezan subdivision.

The languages of the Barbacoan family are divided into two branches. The Cayapa-Colorado branch includes four languages:

(1) Cayapa is spoken mainly on the Cayapa River and its tributaries in extreme northwestern Ecuador by 4,000 people.

(2) Colorado is spoken in Ecuador just south of the equator, between Quito and the coast, by 600 people.

(3) Nigua and

(4) Caranki (Caranqui, Cara) are extinct.

The Pasto branch is represented today by one surviving language:

(5) Cuaiquer (Coaiquer, Coaiker), spoken in Colombia, is probably the only extant member of this branch; other probable members, formerly also spoken largely in Colombia were Pasto, Muellamues, Colima, Patia and Sindagua (Malba).

Inter-Andine (Paez-Coconuco) Family

The languages of this family are or were spoken in the highlands of southwestern Colombia, near the Ecuador border. As noted above, the relationship between the Inter-Andine languages and the Barbacoan languages is so close that they are sometimes considered to belong to the same family.

The Panaquitan (Paez) Branch includes three languages:

(1) Paez is still spoken by 20,000 people, possibly including the Paniquitá, below.

(2) Paniquitá (Panikita) is so closely related to Paez, as to be sometimes considered a dialect of it.

(3) Quilla (Killa), extinct, is sometimes listed as a Barbacoan language, sometimes as a member of the Cundimarcan subgroup of the Chibchan family, but is also classified in the Panaquitan branch of the Inter-Andine family.

The Coconucan Branch includes five languages. The first three listed below were still spoken in the 1930's; the next two — now extinct — were still spoken about a century ago; and the last was extinct long before that:

(4) Moguex (Guambia)

(5) Polindara

(6) Totoró

(7) Coconuco

(8) Guanaco

(9) Puben (Pubenaro).

The Popayanense Branch includes two languages, both of which are extinct:

(10) Popayán

(11) Puracé, which may have been a dialect of Popayán.

Choco Family

Choco (Cholo) has been variously treated as a single language and as a group including dozens of languages. Earlier, Choco was supposed to belong to the Macro-Chibchan phylum; later, to belong to the Macro-Cariban phylum; and now Choco is again re-classified as belonging to the Macro-Chibchan phylum. A recent survey of the Choco languages by Loewen (IJAL 29.239-63, 357-71) distinguishes three languages still spoken, with dialect divisions as listed below; he also points out some similarities between Choco languages and Cuna of the Chibchan family.

The three Choco languages are spoken by between twenty and twenty-five thousand people in an area from the Pacific coast of Panama northward into Panama and southward through the Pacific coastal region of Colombia into Ecuador:

(1) Waunana (Noanamá, Nonama, Chocama, Chanco) is spoken by 2,500 people in Colombia, in the lower San Juan River basin and along the Pacific coast from the mouth of the San Juan River to the upper reaches of the Docordó and Siguirusuá Rivers.

(2) Southern E̦pe̦ra (Emperá) is spoken in Colombia, south, west, and along the coast north of the Waunama area in the following dialects:

  (a) Saixa (Saija), 1,500 speakers
  (b) Baudó (Catio), 2,000 speakers
  (c) Rio Sucio (Citaró), 3,000 speakers
  (d) Tadó, 1,000 speakers
  (e) Chaıní, 2,000 speakers

(3) Northern E̦pe̦ra (Emperá) is spoken north and east of Southern E̦pe̦ra in the following dialects:

  (a) Dabeiba (Dabeibe, Katio, Catio), 4,000 speakers
  (b) San Jorge (Chimila), 1,000 speakers
  (c) Rio Verde, 1,000 speakers
  (d) Sambú (Sambo) 5,000 speakers

Numerous extinct tribes in the same general area are assumed to have spoken Choco languages. These tribal names are often divided into two groups besides the three listed above as languages, perhaps representing two additional — extinct — Choco languages, Cenu (Zenú) and Cauca. Names of these extinct tribes include: Ancerma, Antioquia, Arma, Buritica, Caramanta, Carrapa, Cartama, Cenufana, Corome, Evejico, Funucuna, Mompox, Nutabane (Nutabe), Paparo, Picaro, Pozo, Quimbaya, Tahami, Tolu, Turbaco, Uruba, Zendagua (Zondagua).

Warao (Guarauan) Language Isolate

Warao (Warrau, Guarau, Uarow, Araote, Tivitiva) is spoken by about 10,000 people in Venezuela in the Orinoco Delta and the area between it and the Pomeroon River. The dialects of the Mariusa and Chaguane subtribes may be different from that of the Warao proper. The extinct Waikeri (Guaiqueri, Guayqueri) may have been related to Warao, either as a dialect or as a sister language.

Mura Language Isolate

Mura (Muran, Bohura) is, or was, spoken in the central Amazon basin. Nimuendajú reports that except for the 90 members of the Pirahá subtribe, whose dialect was mutually intelligible with that of at least some of the other Mura, only occasional individuals still spoke Mura in the early 1920's. The last survivors of the Jahahi (Yahahi) subtribe, whose speech may once have been dialectally differentiated, had merged with the Piraha.

Manatawi Language Isolate

In 1922 there were three remaining speakers of Manatawi (Manataui, Mitandu). On the basis of the short vocabulary collected from them, Nimuendajú reports (BAE-B 143.3.258) that "The fact . . . that the Manatawí language has a scant half-dozen words in common with the Mura does not mean that the two languages should be considered . . . as members of the same family."

Jiraran Family

If Jiraran represents a language family, it may not include the languages numbered (4) and (5) below, since the name given for (4) may only be a synonym for a language usually listed as Arawakan. All of these languages except Xagua have been listed as possibly extinct. They were formerly spoken in the area of Lake Maracaibo, Venezuela.

(1) Gayón

(2) Ayoman (Ayomano)

(3) Jirajara (Jiraran)

(4) Xagua (Ajagua, Achagua?)

(5) Cuiba, which may be a dialect of Xagua.

Yunca-Puruhan Phylum

The Yunca-Puruhan phylum consists of a group of extinct coastal languages of Ecuador and northern Peru identified by Mason (BAE-B 143, v.6.193): "As all these 'families' and their component languages are extinct with practically no lexical data, except for Yunca, . . . the degree of relationship will probably never be proved." Information on Yunca comes chiefly from a 1644 grammar.

The main groups assigned to this phylum are Yunca (Yunka, Mochica, Muchik, Chimu, Quingnam) from which Puruhá, Cañari (Canyari) and Manteña (Manabita) differed hardly more than dialectically according to Jijón y Caamaño, and the Atalán 'family' proposed by Rivet as consisting of the languages Manta, Puna, Tumbez, and Huancavilca (Wancavilca), the first three of which Mason, after Jijón y Caamaño, lists under Huancavilca, where he also places Carake, (Caraca, Caraque) with the note that it might rather be classified in Barbacoan. The Tallán (Sec, Sechura) 'family' on the basis of a list of 40 words published in 1864, is also sometimes placed in this phylum, but Sec is listed by Greenberg in the Andean division of the Andean-Equatorial phylum.

Andakí Language Isolate

Andakí (Andaquí), formerly spoken in Colombia, is generally classified in the Chibchan Macro-phylum, sometimes as a member of the Chiban Family.

Itonama Language Isolate

Itonama (Machoto), spoken west of Lake Titicaca in Bolivia, is generally classified (except by Greenberg) as not belonging to any of the major phyla. Nordenskiöld reported the Itonama population as 300 in 1914, but recent missionary sources report it as 4,000.

Atacameño Language Isolate

For Atacameño (Atacama, Cunza, Likananta, Lipe), formerly spoken in northern Chile and northwestern Argentina — far from the general Chibchan area — Greenberg is the first to propose a Chibchan relationship. (The name Atacameño could presumably not have been intended as synonymous with Atacame (Esmeralda), usually classified as Chibchan, since Greenberg lists Esmeralda in his Andean-Equatorial phylum).

GE-PANO-CARIB MACRO-PHYLUM XI

In general, for the Andean regions of South America, the more widely spread languages are spoken by a million people or even by several million people. A paradoxical external feature of the Ge-Pano-Carib macro-phylum and its languages is the large areal spread of the macro-phylum — virtually a continental spread — by relatively low number of speakers.

Languages of this macro-phylum are spoken east of the Andean mountain chain from Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, Paraguay and the Brazilian basin of the Amazon to the north-facing coastlines of Brazil, the Guianas and Venezuela. The languages in the Ge-Pano-Carib macro-phylum are spoken by possibly fewer than a million people; one and a half million speakers represents another estimate, but it is then said that this figure may be much too high.

Previous classifications have treated Ge, Pano, and Carib as independent rather than genetically related groupings. Greenberg's classification relates languages of the three phyla mentioned at the macro-phylum level, combining them in one cognate language group. Greenberg's classification also realigns groups as follows: the Choco group, formerly in North-West Cariban, has been placed in Paezan of Macro-Chibchan; Witotoan, formerly classified as Macro-Tupi-Guarani, is now placed in the Macro-Cariban phylum.

The six Ge-Pano-Carib major divisions are Macro-Ge-Bororo-Caraja, Macro-Panoan, Nambicuara, Huarpe, Macro-Carib and Taruma. The composition of each division is discussed below.

Macro-Ge Phylum

The Macro-Ge phylum — one of the phyla in the Ge-Pano-Carib macro-phylum — includes seven language families — Ge, Caingang, Camacan, Machacali, Puri, Chiquito, Botocudo — and six language isolates: Patacho, Malali, Coropo, Guato, Fulnio and Oti.

Ge Family

Northwest Ge Branch:

The 35 languages of the Northwest Ge branch are spoken entirely in Brazil, concentrated in the eastern and southern areas of the state of Pará, the western half of Maranhão, and the extreme north of Goiás with a few languages in Mato Grosso. The four sub-groups listed are based mainly on geographical criteria. There are probably too many groups listed as speaking separate languages; for example, in the Timbira group, Lowie (BAE-B 143, Vol. I, 477) says the East Timbira (Hoti) 'include 15 tribelets, some dialectically differentiated'. Some of the names given may be names of tribal divisions rather than names of separate languages.

Timbira Subgroup, West Timbira division:

(1) Apinage (Apinaye, West Timbira), 100-250 speakers.

Timbira Subgroup, Hoti (East Timbira) division:

Northern Hoti:

(2) Gurupy

(3) Creye of Bacabal (Tage, Crenge)

(4) Nucoecamecran (Cucoecamecra)

(5) Mehin, extinct.

Southern Hoti:

(6) Apanhecra (Aponegicran)

(7) Ramcocamecra (Merrime, Capiecran), 500 speakers

(8) Macamecran (Pepuchi)

(9) Craho (Kraho, Krao)

(10) Creapimcatage (Crepumcateye)

(11) Cricatage (Macraia, Caracaty, Cricati)

(12) Augutge (Gaviose), 2,000 speakers

(13) Piocobge (Pucobge, Bucobu)

And the following, all of which are extinct:

(14) Crenge of Cajuapara (Crange, Taže)

(15) Caracatage

(16) Chacamecra

(17) Mehin

(18) Norocoage

(19) Paicoge

(20) Poncatage

(21) Purecamecran

(22) Quencatage.

Cayapo (Caiapo) Subgroup:

The Cayapo subgroup is divided into two divisions, Northern and

Southern. The languages of the Northern division are:

(23) Caraho

(24) Gorotire (Xingu Caiapo), 250 speakers

(25) Gradaho (Cradaho, Gradau)

(26) North Cayapo (Ibiraira, Caraja, Coroa, Cayamo), 10,000 speakers

(27) Curupite

(28) Pau d'Arco

(29) Uchicrin (Chicri, Byore)

(30) Cruatire

(31) Duludi

(32) Purucarod, extinct

(33) Ira-Amaire (Purukaru), extinct.

Southern division:

(34) Southern Cayapo may be extinct.

Suya Subgroup:

(35) Suya (Tsuva, Suia)

Central Ge Branch:

The central Ge branch is divided into two groups, the Acua group and the Acroa group. The latter is comprised of two subgroups, Northern and Southern.

Acua Subgroup:

(36) Chavante (Crisca, Pusciti, Tapacua)

(37) Cherente

(38) Chacriabe, extinct

(39) Goya, extinct.

Acroa Subgroup, Northern:

(40) Aricobe

(41) Guegue

(42) North Acroa

(43) Arua, extinct

(44) Ponta, extinct

(45) Timbira, extinct

Acroa Subgroup, Southern:

(46) South Acroa.

Jeico Branch:

(47) Jeico (Jaico, Jaicuju, Jahycu), a language which became extinct in the 1850's, for which a brief vocabulary exists, has been classified by Mason as the sole language of the Jeico branch of the Ge family.

Johannes Wilbert (AL4:2.17-25(1962)) offers a revised classification of the Ge family of languages, based on glottochronology. He apparently combines the Cayapo group and the Suya group in his Cayapo family and then calls the remainder of the Northwest Ge branch the Apinaye family. The Central Ge branch he terms the Acroa family. These three families cannot be entirely equated or unified with the McQuown classification since some of the names are different and since Wilbert's list does not include all of the languages listed above.

Caingang Family

The languages of the Caingang (Kaingang) family, with the exception of Ivitorocai of eastern Paraguay, are spoken in Brazil and, according to Jules Henry, extend into the state of Misiones in Argentina.

Caingang (Coroado, Kaingang, Caingaingi) Branch:

The languages of the Caingang branch are spoken in southeastern Brazil in the states of São Paulo, Paraná, Santa Catarina, and Rio Grande do Sul. The only figures available indicate from 3,000 to 4,000 speakers, but it is not clear whether this estimate includes all or only one of the languages of the branch.

(1) Nhacfateitei (Nyacfateitei)

(2) São Paulo Caingang, extinct

(3) Paraná Caingang

(4) Rio Grande do Sul Caingang

(5) Chiqui, extinct.

Chocren Branch:

The Chocren branch is represented by only one language spoken in the eastern part of the state of Sta. Catarina:

(6) Chocren (Bugre, Botocudo, Caingua, Shocleng, Aweicoma)

Ţaven Branch:

This branch is almost extinct, with one language known to be still spoken in Paraguay and possibly another in southern Mato Grosso in Brazil.

(7) Ivitorocai (Amho), in Paraguay

(8) Cabelludo, in Brazil, probably extinct

(9) Chiqui, extinct

(10) Guiana, extinct

(11) Gualachi, extinct

(12) Tain (Ingain), extinct; Metraux (BAE-B 143, Vol. I, 446) however, speaks of Tain (Ingain) as being an alternate name for Ivitorocai; the latter term is also the name of the stream on which the main settlement is located.

Dorin Branch:

This fourth branch of the Caingang family may now be extinct. Its sole language has been listed by McQuown (1955) as probably extinct:

(13) Dorin.

Camacan Family

The only language of the Camacan family which may still be spoken is Camacan in eastern Brazil. Mason comments on the family: "There is general agreement as to the languages composing the family. As regards the closer relationships of these languages, there is little agreement." Four branches are given by Mason:

Camacan Branch:

(1) Camacan, possibly extinct.

Cutachoan Branch, extinct:

(2) Cutacho

(3) Catethoi.

Menian Branch, extinct:

(4) Menia (Manya).

Massacara Branch, extinct:

(5) Massacara.

Machacali Family

Of the six languages of the Machacali family, four are extinct, and two are still spoken in the state of Minas Gerais, Brazil. Mason mentions that "six 'languages' are placed by all authorities in this family, all given equal rank, and no further subdivisions are proposed". However, McQuown (1955) has, since Mason, added a seventh 'language'.

(1) Capocho, extinct
(2) Cumanacho, extinct
(3) Macuni, extinct
(4) Machacali (Maxakali)
(5) Monocho, 250 speakers
(6) Panhame, extinct
(7) Paraxim, extinct.

Puri (Coroado) Family

The Puri family, in eastern Minas Gerais, Brazil, is subdivided into two branches, with one language in each branch.

(1) Puri (Telicon), with three dialects: Shamisuna, Sabonam, and Wambori.

(2) Coroado, spoken in Espirito Santo, with four dialects: Maritong, Cobanipake, Tamprun, Sasaricon.

Chiquito Family

The three languages of the Chiquito family are spoken in central and eastern Bolivia.

(1) Chiquito (Tarapecosi, Yuncarirx), 2,000 speakers

(2) Penyoqui (Penokikia, Penoki), with five dialects: Penyoqui, Pinyoca, Cuciquia, Tao, and Tabiica

(3) Churapa (Southern Chiquito).

Patacho Language Isolate

Patacho is spoken in southeastern Bahia, Brazil, from the seaboard to as far inland as the headwaters of the Porto Seguro and the Jucurucu Rivers.

Malali Language Isolate

Malali, now extinct, was spoken at the headwaters of the Aracuai River in Brazil.

Coropo Language Isolate

Coropo, now extinct, was spoken in the region between the Doce and the Parahyba Rivers in Brazil.

Botocudo Family

The term 'Botocudo' refers to wearers of large lip plugs, and this has interfered with the language referent use of the term; several 'Botocudo' groups, not belonging to the same language family, need to be differentiated. The languages of the Botocudo family of the Macro-Ge phylum are or were spoken in the states of Minas Gerais and Espirito Santo, Brazil.

(1) Arana

(2) Chonvugn

(3) Crecmun

(4) Gueren, extinct

(5) Gutucrac (Minhagirun), probably extinct

(6) Nacrehe

(7) Yiporoc (Giporoc, Poica), extinct

(8) Anquet (Anket), extinct

(9) Nacnhanuc (Nacŋyanuk)

(10) Aimore, extinct

(11) Aimbore, extinct

(12) Poica (Poyisha, Požitxa), extinct.

Guato Language Isolate

Guato, probably extinct, was formerly spoken in the state of Mato Grosso, Brazil and in adjacent parts of Bolivia.

Fulnio Language Isolate

Fulnio (Iate, Carnijo), is spoken in the state of Pernambuco, Brazil. In 1946, the Fulnio numbered about 1,500 persons.

Oti Language Isolate

Oti (Chavante), an extinct language of inland southeastern Brazil, is classified by Greenberg as only a probable member of the Macro-Ge phylum.

With Oti, we come to the end of the list of families and language isolates in the Macro-Ge phylum, which is one part of the larger Macro-Ge-Bororo-Caraja division. We now turn to other parts of that division.

Bororo Family

Bororo is listed by Greenberg as the unique member of a subdivision of the Macro-Ge-Bororo-Caraja division of the Ge-Pano-Carib Macro-phylum. The languages of the Bororo family are divided into two branches: the Bororo branch on the lowlands of Mato Grosso, Brazil; and the Otuque branch on the extensions of the Mato Grosso lowlands into eastern Bolivia.

Bororo Branch:

(1) Eastern Bororo (Coroado, Orarimugudoge) is spoken by 500 to 1,000 people.

(2) Western Bororo (Cabasal, Campanha)

(3) Umotina (Barbado)

(4) Biriune

(5) Aravira

(6) Acione.

Otuque Branch:

Otuque Subgroup:

(7) Otuque (Louxiru)

(8) Curuminaca, extinct.

Coraveca Subgroup:

(9) Coraveca, extinct

(10) Curave, extinct.

Caraja Family

The Caraja family is listed by Greenberg as the unique member of a subgroup of the Macro Ge-Bororo-Caraja division of the Ge-Pano-Carib Macro-phylum. The four languages of this family are divided into three branches.

Caraja Branch:

(1) Caraja (Karaha), spoken by 500 to 1,000 people in the border regions of the states of Mato Grosso, Pará, and Goiás, Brazil.

(2) Carajahi, formerly spoken northeast of the Caraja, is now probably extinct.

Javahe Branch:

(3) Javahe (Javae), spoken by 250 to 500 persons, located south of the Caraja.

Chambioa Branch:

(4) Chambioa, formerly spoken in the northern tip of Goiás, Brazil, is now extinct.

Macro-Panoan Phylum

The Macro-Panoan phylum, spreads over a wide area from Peru eastward to Brazil and Bolivia, and southward to Paraguay and Argentina. Tradition has the forebears of speakers of the modern languages migrating from the north, but subsequent history gives evidence of some groups backtracking and dispersing.

None of the following subgroups are listed by Greenberg as being more closely related to one member of the phylum than to another member of the phylum; that is, they are coordinate members of the Macro-Panoan phylum: Tacana-Pano (a family), Moseten (a family), Mataco (a family), Lule, Vilela, Mascoy, Charrua, and Guaycuru-Opaie (a family). Before

Greenberg, all of these — except Tacana-Pano and Moseten — had been assigned either to a Macro-Guaycuru phylum or had been considered as possibly related to members of such a phylum. However, the lexical comparisons made by Greenberg did not reveal closer relationship between the 'Macro-Guaycuru' languages, apparently, than to the languages of the Tacana-Pano or Mosteten families; hence, we do not regard Macro-Guaycuru (Macro-Guaicuru) as a separate linguistic unit.

Tacana-Pano Family

The Tacana languages were classified by Mason as an independent family on the basis of earlier conflicting classifications of Tacanan as either Panoan or Arawakan. On the basis of Greenberg's classification of Tacanan as the member of the Macro-Panoan phylum most closely related to Panoan, Tacanan and Panoan are treated below as branches of one family. The Pano branch has been subdivided into three groups and the Tacana branch ~~into~~ five groups.

Pano Branch (perhaps total of 15,000 speakers):

Central Pano Group:

The languages of the Central group are spoken around the Amazon headwaters in Peru and in adjacent Brazil.

(1) Conibo (Chama), with 3,000 speakers in 1940, has three mutually intelligible dialects (Lauriault, IJAL 14.22):

(a) Conibo

(b) Shipibo (Xipibo), with subdialects Sinabo, Manaua, and Manamabobo

(probably extinct)

(c) Shetebo (Setebo), with subdialects Sensi and Panobo. Remo is cited by Steward and Metraux as a tribe speaking both Shipibo and Setebo dialects.

(2) Cashibo (Comabo, Caxibo). Olive A. Shell (IJAL 16.198, 1950) speaks of the Cashibo tribe as restricted to a few hundred families. Mason lists the following dialects: Buninahua (Buninawa), Caxinyo (Cashino), Cacataibo, Puchanahua (Puchanawa), Runyo, Xirino (Shirino).

(3) Culino (Curina) is extinct.

(4) Capanahua (Kapanawa) including Busquipani

(5) Remo, including Sacuya

(6) Maspo, possibly including Epetineri

(7) Nucuini, including Cuyanawa

(8) Niarawa (Niaragua)

(9) Puyamanawa

(10) Amahuaca (Amenguaca, Ipitinere, Sayaco) totals 3,000 to 4,000 speakers. Dialects of Amahuaca include Cashinawa, Sheminawa, Inuvakeu and Viwivakeu.

(11) Pichobo (Pisobo), including Soboibo, Ruanawa, Mochobo and Comobo.

(12) Catuquina (Catukina, Caripuna, Juanauo). This Catuquina is distinquished from the Arawakan Catuquina and the Macro-Tucanoan Catuquina. All are spoken in the basins of the Jurua and Purús tributaries of the Amazon River, Brazil, close to the Peru border. The Catuquina of

the Central Pano group are located on the north bank of the Jurua River. Dialects of Catuquina are: Arara, including Jauanaua (Shawanawa); Saninaua, including Saninauaca; Ararawa and Ararapira.

The list of names following are those of Panoan tribes located in a multi-language region; i.e. the Jurua-Puru riverine basins of the Upper Amazon. Panoan, Arawakan and Catuquinan languages interpenetrate, often spanning ethnic and cultural boundaries. The whole Jurua-Purus region is one of deep forests and connecting waterways; in the historical period, this region functioned as a refuge area for fugitives from slave raids, intergroup conflicts, and former missionaries from Spain.

The names below (after 13) are those of known Panoan tribes whose linguistic affiliations to each other or to Panoan languages outside the riverine basins have not been ascertained. They are given without comment as components of Jurua-Purus, a cover term given them by Mason.

(13) Jurua-Purus: Poianaua, Chipinaua, Aranaua, Janavo (Yanavo), Jaminaua (Yaminawa), Runanaua (Rununawa), Contanaua, Pacanaua, Jumbanaua, Jura, Tuchinaua, Marinaua, Espino, Manaua (Manamabobo), Canamari.

Southwest Pano Group:

The three languages of the Southwest Pano Group are spoken in the Inambari River basin in Peru.

(14) Arasa (Arasaire, Arazaire), extinct

(15) Atsahuaca (Atsawaca), with two dialects, Atsahuaca (Chaspa), extinct,

and Yamiaca (Hasuneiri)

(16) Araua.

Though these constitute the Southwest Pano group, Mason states "Some of the Arasa and Atsawaca also speak Tacana (Arawak?) and are often classified in that group."

Southeast Pano (Pacaguara) Group:

Sources generally agree on four languages in this geographic group. A fifth, still spoken, is tentatively added by Mason. These languages are spoken in the Madeira-Madre de Dios tributaries area of northeasternmost Bolivia and adjacent Brazil.

(17) Zurina.

Languages (18) through (21), below, are collectively called Pacawara.

(18) Chacobo, 135 speakers

(19) Caripuna (Jau-navo) including

(20)Capuibo

(21) Sinabo (Gritones)

Tacana Branch:

The languages of the Tacana branch are spoken in the confluence zone between the upper Madre de Dios, upper Beni and Mamore Rivers of Bolivia and adjacent Peru. The Tacana branch is divided into five groups reflecting geographical locations and tribal divisions rather than solid linguistic criteria for grouping.

Araona (Arauna) Group:

The languages of the Araona group are all spoken in Bolivia:

(22) Capachene

(23) Cavinya, spoken by 100 people

(24) Cavinenyo

(25) Mabenaro

(26) Machui.

Arasa Group:

(27) Arasa is spoken by some members of the same Arasa tribe mentioned above who also speak a language in the Panoan branch

Chirigua (Maropa) Group:

(28) Maropa, spoken northeast of the upper reaches of the Beni River, Bolivia

(29) Chumana

(30) Sapibocona

Tacana (Tucana, Takana) Group:

There are 2,000 speakers of fourteen Tacana languages. The languages of the Tacana group are spoken downriver from Maropa.

(31) Ayaychuna

(32) Babayana

(33) Chiliuvo

(34) Chivamona

(35) Indiama, Isiama

(36) Pamaino

(37) Pasaramona

(38) Saparuna

(39) Siliama

(40) Tumapasa (Maracani)

(41) Turamona (Toromona)

(42) Uchupiamona

(43) Yabaypura

(44) Yubamona.

Tiatinagua Group:

Languages of the Tiatinagua group are spoken west of and adjacent to the Tacana language area, specifically along the upper Beni, Madidi, and Undumo Rivers of Bolivia and Peru:

(45) Guacanahua (Guarayo, Guanacanahua)

(46) Chama

(47) Baguaja (Baguajairi)

(48) Chuncho (Chunchu)

(49) Echoja

(50) Huanayo

(51) Kinaki

(52) Mohino.

Yamaluba Group:

(53) Yamaluba.

Moseten Family

Moseten was considered to be an independent family by Mason and others. Greenberg's classification places Moseten in the Macro-Panoan phylum. The two languages of this family were spoken along the Wopi and Quiquire Rivers. In the late 19th century the Moseten were relocated to the Missions of Covendo, Santa Ana, and Muchanes. Mason lists nine names subordinate to Moseten and three names subordinate to Chimane with the statement "it is not certain how these are related, which ones are synonyms, or whether the linguistic divergences are on a dialect level or greater."

(1) Moseten

(2) Chimane, several thousand speakers.

Mataco Family

Languages and dialects of the Mataco language family stretch chainwise from the Andean foothills almost to the Paraguay River across the Gran Chaco of northern Argentina into Paraguay. At the end of the 19th century there were about 20,000 Mataco speakers. Many worked as lumberjacks, or on sugar plantations; they were being assimilated into the dominant Spanish-speaking linguistic community. Language names which follow are also tribal names; sub-tribal divisions may (or may not) be dialect divisions. Two branches — Mataco and Maca — are given.

Mataco Branch:

Mataco-Mataguayo Group:

(1) Mataco, 500 speakers in Bolivia; number of speakers is not known for Argentina and Paraguay. Listed as dialects from different historical periods are Guisnay and Nocten (Octenai).

(2) Mataguayo (Vejoz), with the dialects Huexuo, Pesatupe, and Vejoz

Choroti-Ashluslay Group:

(3) Choroti (Yofuaha, Xolota)

(4) Ashushlay (Axluslay, Chulupi, Chonopi, Suhin, Sotiagay, Tapiete)

Maca Branch:

(5) Maca (Enimaga)

(6) Guentuse, extinct

(7) Lengua (Cochaboth), extinct.

Lule-Vilela-Charrua Family

The extinct Lule and Vilela languages of the Argentinan Chaco were treated as members of the same family in classifications as early as Brinton's (1891). Only the classification of Loukotka (1935) had placed Lule and Vilela in separate families, a classification apparently followed by Greenberg who lists them separately as members of the Macro-Panoan phylum. Though apparently a considerable amount of data exists on Vilela, so little exists on Lule that it may never be possible to demonstrate by the comparative method that Lule and Vilela are members of the same family. It is not certain that the names Lule and Vilela each represent single languages; a number of tribal divisions have been listed for each, with conflicting assignments of particular tribes to one or the other group. Some of these tribes may have spoken different languages, possibly even unrelated languages.

Perhaps by accident, Nimuendajú listed as one of the Vilela-speaking tribes the Güenoa, an extinct Uruguayan tribe. The Indians of Uruguay were already beginning to replace their native languages with Guarani at the time of first Spanish contact; consequently, although the names of quite a few groups have been recorded, little information was available on their languages. Through extensive historical information and intensive work with all the available linguistic information, including three newly discovered vocabularies, Jose Pedro Rona of the University of Uruguay has been able to identify positively all of the various tribal names as synonyms of or subgroups of only four groups; and to show that the languages spoken by these four groups all belonged to the same family (paper given orally at Indiana University, Spring, 1965). Whether these four were actually separate languages or only divergent dialects of one language remains indeterminate, for lack of sufficient information. On comparing the new vocabularies of the Uruguayan languages with those of Vilela, Rona found almost identity of forms; hence, the extinct languages of Uruguay can now be certainly placed in the same family as Vilela. The components of the family are accordingly listed as:

(1) Lule, formerly spoken in Argentina

(2) Vilela, for which Mason includes such subdivisions as Atalala, Chunupi, Malbala, Ocole, Pasain, Umuapa, Vacaa, Yecoanita and Yooc, formerly spoken in Argentina.

(3) Charrua, formerly spoken in Uruguay

(4) Guenoa, formerly spoken in Uruguay

(5) Chana (Yaro), formerly spoken in Uruguay

(6) Minuane, formerly spoken in Uruguay.

Mascoy Language Isolate

The Mascoy (Mascoi) lived on both sides of the Pilcomayo and Paraguay Rivers, and above the confluence of these rivers, in the Gran Chaco of Paraguay. The Mascoi were reported by Azara (1809) as being composed of nineteen bands. Mason lists 'six scarcely differentiated dialects': Angaite, including Enenslet; Casquiha (Guana); Lengua (Gecoinlahaac); Mascoi, including Machicui (Tujetge); Sanapana; Sapaqui (Conamesma); McQuown adds another name, Caiotugui.

Guaycuru-Opaie Family

The languages of the Guaycuru-Opaie family are spoken in the Gran Chaco of northern Argentina and Paraguay, and into Bolivia and Brazil. Mason lists Opaie as unclassified; Greenberg treats it as most closely related to Guaycuru. Opaie and Guaycuru are listed below as branches of one family. Subdivisions of the branches as given by Mason were based on subdivisions of the tribes into groups, and of groups into bands. Band names were derived generally from an animate or inanimate characteristic of the environment (e.g. Apacachodegodegi people of the rhea country; Guetiadegodi people of the mountains, etc.). Nearly all the groups are extinct. Only the three major divisions are listed below as separate languages of the Guaycuru branch.

Guaycuru Branch:

(1) Guaycuru (Guaicuru, Mbaya), including such subgroups as the Caduveo, Guetiadegodi (Guetiadebo), Apacachodegodegi (Mbaya Mirin), Lichagotegodi, Eyibogodegi, Gotocogegodegi, Payagua (Lengua), Sarigue, and Magach.

(2) Toba (Tocowit, Middle Frentones), including as subgroups the Pilaga and the Aguilot.

(3) Abipon-Mocovi (South Frentones), including as Abipon subgroups the Yaukaniga (Mapenuss), Mepence, and Gulgaissen.

Opaie Branch:

(4) Opaie.

Nambicuara Family

The languages of the Nambicuara (Nhambicuara) family are spoken in Brazil. Levi-Strauss (as reported by Mason) divides the three languages into two groups: Nambicuara Proper and Pseudo-Nambicuara. The Pseudo-Nambicuara language — Sabane — is so very different that it may not really belong in the same family as Nambicuara Proper.

Nambicuara Proper:

(1) Northeast Nambicuara for which McQuown lists four dialects: Anunze, Cocuzu (Kokuzu), Congore and Nene

(2) Southwest Nambicuara, for which seven dialects are listed: Tagnani, Tauite, Uaintazu, and Tamainde, Cabichi (Kabishi), Tarute, and Tashuite.

Pseudo-Nambicuara:

(3) Sabane.

Huarpe Family

The languages of the Huarpe family were formerly spoken in the upper reaches of the tributaries of the Colorado and Negro Rivers in southern Argentina. Although the Huarpe languages became extinct in the 18th century, several missionary grammars and vocabulary lists were written.

(1) Huarpe (Guarpe, Allentiac) is known to be closely related to

(2) Millcayac.

Other languages suggested as related to these include:

(3) Puelche and

(4) Pehuenche.

Macro-Carib Phylum

The Macro-Carib phylum includes three language families — Carib, Peban, Witotoan — and one language isolate, Cucura.

Carib Family

The majority of the Cariban languages are spoken in Venezuela, the Guianas and north central Brazil; a few are spoken in other parts of Brazil and in Colombia.

The internal relationships of the languages in the Carib family have not been worked out on a comparative linguistic basis. It may well be that some of the languages listed below as members of the Carib family have so few shared cognates that it will turn out that we are concerned with a Carib phylum rather than with a Carib family. And beside those languages listed which are genetically related, however remotely, there may be an occasional language included in the list which is not at all genetically related to the others — for example, Arecuna; Mason points out that Nimuendajú lists an Arawakan Arecuna in the same region.

The subgrouping of Carib languages given here, after Mason and McQuown, is primarily geographic. Three major groups are listed as branches — Northern, Southern and Northwestern — each of which is further subdivided. There are probably fewer languages than the number of names listed would imply — in many cases several tribes listed as speaking separate languages probably speak the same language. In other cases tribal names subsumed under a single group name, as though speaking a single language, may actually speak different languages.

Island Carib, often assigned to the northern branch, is actually an Arawakan language.

Northern Branch:

Coastal Northern Group:

Coastal Northern Carib languages are still spoken in Venezuela, the Guianas and adjacent Brazil, but generally by only a few speakers each.

(1) Carib, with dialects as follows: Caribice in British Guiana; Galibi, 500 speakers in Brazil, French Guiana, British Guiana and Surinam; Calinya in Surinam.

(2) Cumanagoto, now extinct

(3) Palank (Palenque, Guarine) now extinct

(4) Pariagoto (Paria, Guayuno)

(5) Oyana (Upurui, Alukuyana, Oiana, Ayara, Uaiana, Wayana), including Rucuyen, Urucuiana, 350 speakers in Surinam, 100 speakers in Brazil, others in French Guiana.

(6) Chacopoto, now extinct

(7) Piritu, now extinct

(8) Cunewara (Cuneguara) now extinct

(9) Xiparicot (Shiparicot, Chipa), now extinct

(10) Core, probably extinct

(11) Chayma (Sayma, Chaima, Warapiche), including Tagare and Guaga, all now extinct

(12) Carinepagoto, now extinct.

Central Northern Group:

Roraima Subgroup:

(13) Acawai, including Patamona

(14) Purucoto (Porocoto, Urukoto)

(15) Arecuna (Jaricuna, Pemon) with Camaracoto and Taulipang (Taurepan, Ipurucoto); Ipurucoto is said to have 500 speakers, but this figure may include speakers of other dialects of the same language.

(16) Arinagoto, probably extinct.

(17) Macushi (Macusi, Teweya, Teueia), 2,500 speakers in British Guiana, others in Brazil, where they are called Teueia

(18) Uaica (Waica), Venezuela, British Guiana, said to be not the same as the Waica of the Waica family

(19) Ingaricó, 500 speakers, British Guiana and Brazil.

(20) Sapara, in Brazil and Colombia

(21) Wayumará (Guimara, Uaiumara), now extinct.

(22) Parviyana (Paravilhana), in Venezuela, now extinct.

(23) Quenoloco (Kenoloco), in British Guiana and Brazil

(24) Monoico, in British Guiana

(25) Azumara, in Brazil, now probably extinct

(26) Pauichana (Paushiana), in Brazil.

(27) Mapoyo (Mapoye), in Venezuela

(28) Taparito, in Venezuela

(29) Panari, in west central Venezuela, 1,000 speakers.

Ventuari Subgroup:

(30) Maquiritare (Makiritare, Maquiritai), in Venezuela — including Mayongong (Yecuana) with 1,000 speakers, Maitsi, Ihuruana, Decuana (Wainungomo), Cunuana.

(31) Yabarana, including Curasicana and Wokiare.

Amazon Northern Group:

(32) Pianocoto (Catauian, Parukutu), 500 speakers in British Guiana and Brazil

(33) Apalai, with Aracuaju, 250 speakers in Brazil.

(34) Waiwai (Uaiuai, Uaieue, Ouayeone), 150 speakers in British Guiana and Brazil

(35) Pauxi (Pauchi), in Brazil

(36) Trio, 780 speakers in Surinam

(37) Diau, in British Guiana

(38) Shikiana (Chikena) in Brazil, extinct

(39) Tivericoto, in Brazil

(40) Cumayena (Ocomayana), in Surinam

(41) Urucuena

(42) Carijona (Omagua, Umawa) — including Guaque, Tsahatsaha, Guagua, Riama, Caicuchana, Mahotoyana, and Yacaoyana — all spoken in Colombia.

Bonari Northern Group:

The languages of the Bonari group of Northern Cariban are:

(43) Bonari, in Brazil, now extinct

(44) Jauaperi (Yauaperi, Crishana), including Atroahy, in Brazil, now extinct.

(45) Uaimiri (Waimiry) in Brazil

(46) Mutuan, in Brazil.

Southern Branch:

All the languages of the Southern Branch are spoken south of the Amazon in Brazil:

South Southern Cariban Group:

(47) Apiaca (Apingui)

(48) Timirem (Pariri)

(49) Arara is extinct or nearly extinct

Xingu Southern Cariban Group:

(50) Bacairi, 250 speakers

(51) Guicuru (Kurikuro, Cuicutl), 250 speakers.

(52) Apalakiri (Apalai, Calapalo) 250 speakers.

(53) Mariape-Nahucua (Anauqua)

(54) Naravute

(55) Yaruma (Jaruma)

(56) Yamarikuma (Jamarikuma)

(57) Akuku

(58) Palmella, spoken on the Sa do Norte tributary of the Amazon, is the southwesternmost Carib language.

(59) Pimenteira is spoken on the Parraiba River, far east of any other Carib language; however, it is classified by Nimuendajú as a member of the Botocudo family in the Macro-Ge phylum.

Northwestern Branch:

Northwestern Carib languages are subgrouped as the Maracaibo-Magdalena group, the Southwest group, the Southeast group, and the Cenu-Cauca group.

Maracaibo-Magdalena Northwestern Group:

The Maracaibo-Magdalena languages are all spoken in Venezuela unless otherwise indicated below; the tribes listed under numbers (60) through (63) are collectively called Motilon.

(60) Chake, including Macoa, Tucuco, and Pariri.

(61) Mape, including Macoita, Manastara, Yasa, Chapara, Sicacao, Tucuco, Cunaguasata, Maraca, Aguas Blancas, Aricuaisa, Catatumbo, Irapeno.

(62) Carate

(63) Zapara

(64) Bubure (Coronado)

(65) Yarigui (Quiriquire, Kirikire), including Topocoro, Topoyo, Chiacota, Araya, Guamaca, Tholomeo

(66) Opón

(67) Carare including Naura, Nauracoto, and Colima (Tapas), including Murca, Marpapi, Curipa; however, Carare is often classified as Arawakan.

(68) Muso (Muzo)

(69) Burede

(70) Guanao

(71) Pemeno

(72) Patagon

(73) Camaniba.

Southwest Northwestern Group:

(74) Gorron

(75) Buga

(77) Chanco.

Southeast Northwestern Group:

(77) Arvi

(78) Patangoro (Palenque), including Tamana, Guarino, Guagna, Zamana, and Doyma

(79) Panche, including Guazquia, Guali, Marqueton

(80) Pijao, including Quindio, Cutiba, Irico, Toche, and Cacataima.

Cenu-Cauca Northwestern Group:

Choco languages formerly listed as belonging to this group have now been re-classified as constituting a family within the Macro-Chibchan phylum. Then the remaining members of this geographic subgroup are:

(81) Cenu (Zenu), including Cenufana and Nutabare (Nutabe) plus Tahami

(82) Cauca, including Quimbaya plus Carrapa, Picara and Paucura; Ancerma plus Caramanta, Cartama, Nori and Guaca; Antioquia plus Buritica, Corome and Evejico; Arma plus Pozo.

Peba-Yaguan Family

The only living languages of the Peba-Yaguan (Peban) family are Yagua and Yameo, in Peru west of Iquitos on the Marañon River and along the Amazon River, and in the Peru-Brazil-Colombia border area.

(1) Yagua is spoken by 2,000 people. There are four mutually intelligible Yagua dialects: Pebas (which may be Peba, listed as a separate language below), Gochaquinas, Atacuari, and Colombia.

(2) Peba is extinct, unless it is now identified as a dialect of Yagua, above.

(3) Yameo is spoken in the San Regis area of Peru by an undetermined number of speakers.

Witotoan Family

The Witotoan languages are spoken mainly in southeastern Colombia between the Caqueta and the Putumayo Rivers.

(1) Witoto (Huitoto) is spoken by some 4,000 to 5,000 people in Colombia; by 80 or more families in northern Peru between Iquitos and the Colombia border; and by perhaps 100 speakers in Brazil. The three main dialects of Witoto are: Muinani, Murui, and Minica. The Muniani dialect is phonologically much more complex than the other two dialects — so much more so, that Muinani speakers switch easily to one of the other dialects while the reverse is not possible. The Minica dialect, spoken mainly in Colombia, occupies an intermediate position between Muiani and Murui, being more like Muinani in stress pattern and lexicon, and more like Muri in phonemic inventory.

Witotoan languages other than Witoto proper all are spoken in Colombia unless otherwise indicated below.

Bora Miranya Group:

(2) Bora

(3) Fitita

(4) Ocaina (Ducaiya), 200 speakers in northeastern Peru

(5) Nonuya (Achiote, Anyonola)

(6) Muenane (Muinani, Muinana), 100 speakers

(7) Miranya (Andoquero, Carapana).

The linguistic position of the following languages in the Witoto family has not been determined; all are extinct:

(8) Orejon

(9) Northern Andoque

(10) Southern Andoque

(11) Araracuara

(12) Resigero.

Cucura Language Isolate

The Cucura language isolate was regarded as an unclassified Carib language by Mason. Greenberg regards Cucura as related to Carib, Peban, and Witotoan languages at the phylum level. Cucura was spoken near the Verde River of Mato Grosso, Brazil. The language is probably now extinct.

Taruma Language Isolate

Rivet, Loukotka, Schmidt, and Gillin all classify Taruma as an Arawakan language, with Loukotka subclassifying it as a mixed language. Mason classifies Taruma as one of the 'languages of probably Arawakan affinities'. Greenberg has placed Taruma as related to the Ge-Pano-Carib languages at the macro-phylum level. Formerly spoken in Brazil and Paraguay, it is now extinct, or very nearly so.

ANDEAN-EQUATORIAL MACRO-PHYLUM XII

Greenberg's Andean-Equatorial macro-phylum includes a large number of cognate language groups not previously considered related — phyla like Macro-Tupi-Guarani and Quechumaran, families like Jivaroan, and numerous single languages previously considered completely unrelated to other languages or at least unclassified. In addition to relating languages freshly, Greenberg's classification realigns the membership of previously suggested groups — e.g. the Witotoan family, previously considered a member of the Macro-Tupi-Guarani phylum, is placed in the Macro-Carib section of the Ge-Pano-Carib phylum; and the Candoshi language, previously considered a member of the Zaporoan family, is placed as most closely related to Jivaroan.

The Andean-Equatorial phylum is subdivided by Greenberg into four major divisions — Andean, Macro-Tucanoan, Equatorial and a group including Jivaroan, Candoshi, Esmeralda, Cofan and Yaruro. The composition of each of these groups is discussed below.

Andean Division of the Andean-Equatorial Macro-Phylum

The Andean division is subdivided into five groups, One to Five below, after Greenberg.

Group One of the Andean Division

This group consists of one small language family (Chon) and four language isolates.

Chon (Ona-Chon) Family

To the two languages listed below as members of the Chon family, Swadesh (CA 4.318, 1963) would add Moseten of Bolivia which Greenberg lists in the Macro-Panoan division of the Ge-Pano-Carib phylum.

(1) Chon (Tehuelche, Tewelche), formerly spoken in the Argentinan part of Patagonia from the Rio Colorado south to the Strait of Magellan, is perhaps still spoken by a few families recently reported to be living in the region of Rio Gallegos and Lago Argentino. There were formerly three Chon dialects: Teuex (Teuesh, Tă'uüshn), which was spoken by only a few old people around 1900; Payniken or northern, which was possibly also the dialect of the Poya; and Inaquen (Inaken) or southern.

(2) Ona, spoken on Tierra del Fuego, formerly had two sharply differentiated dialects — Huash (Huax) and Shelknam (Selcnam). In the early 1940's the Ona population was estimated to be no more than fifty.

Araucanian Language Isolate

Araucanian (Mapuche, Araukan, Aucan) is spoken by about 200,000 people in Chile, chiefly in the provinces of Bío-Bío, Malleco, and Cautín, and by another 8,000 people in the province of Neuguén in Argentina. Rodolfo Lenz who did linguistic work on Araucanian in the 1890's divided the Araucanian spoken in Chile into the following three dialects (Suárez, IJAL 25.177):

(a) Picunche

(b) Huilliche (Hüilliche)

(c) Pehuenche (Pewenche)-Moluche (Mapuche).

Araucanian-speaking tribes listed elsewhere as subdivisions of these, which may or may not be dialectally differentiated include, under Huiliche: Serrano Huiliche, Pichihuilliche and Manzanero; under Pehuenche, Ranquelche, and grouped with Huiliche, Chilote (Veliche), Cuncho (Chikiyami) and Leuvuche. Also listed as possibly (eastern) dialects of Araucanian are Taluche (Taluhet) and Diviche (Divihet).

Alacaluf Language Isolate

The Alacaluf (Alakaluf, Alikuluf) formerly occupied the southern coast of Chile and adjacent islands. Names of a number of local groups are listed as having possibly spoken separate dialects of Alacaluf, as Chono, Aduipliin (Adwipliin), Caucahue (Caucawe), Enoo (Peshera), Lecheyel, and Yequinahue (Yekinawe), but little information is available on the speech of these groups — e.g. only three words are known for Chono; and most are extinct. Estimates of the present Alacaluf population vary from zero to four hundred.

Yahgan Language Isolate

The Yahgan formerly occupied the southern coast of Tierra del Fuego and the smaller islands to the south of it. In 1933 there were only forty remaining Yahgan individuals.

Puelche Language Isolate

Puelche (Pampa, Northern Tehuelche) was spoken in the Pampas of Argentina, but may now be extinct; by 1940 the Puelche population was perhaps as few as ten individuals.

Group Two of the Andean Division =
Quechumaran (Kechumaran) Phylum

The term Quechumaran was proposed as early as 1890 (by Steinthal); Mason in 1950 designated Jijón y Caamaño (Las lenguas del sur de Centro America, in El Ecuador Interandino y Occidental 3.390-661, 1943), as the first to suggest the genetic affiliation of Quechua and Aymara.

McQuown is unimpressed by Jijón y Caamaño's arguments, and concludes that although Quechua morphology and Aymara morphology are fundamentally the same, the 1943 support for Quechumaran "... treats phonetic correspondences in a cavalier fashion, and pushes the period of unity into the dim and distant past. Arguments for morphology alone, unsupported by a substantial corpus of lexical material in which regular sound correspondences from language to language are demonstrated, can never be conclusive."

Jijón y Caamaño, and J. P. Harrington (Hokan discovered in South America, Journal of the Washington Academy of Science 33.334-344, 1943) also put forward the possible affinity of Quechumaran to Hokan-Siouan.

(1) Quechua (Kechua, Quichua) is spoken by about six million people in Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Argentina and Chile — probably more if bilinguals are included. The Quechua-speaking people originally had their provenience in the upper Apurimac and Urubamba drainage in the southern Peruvian highlands until the wars of conquest which probably began under the Pachacuti about 1450. Until this time it was one of many, related and unrelated, Andean languages. With the spread of the Inca, however, Quechua supplanted many of these small languages, as it became the administrative language of the empire. Aymara (see (2) below) was first to come into contact with the

Incas when the latter moved south in their early campaigns. Many tribes formerly speaking Aymara (e.g. Caranga, Quillagua, Omasuyo) began to speak Quechua.

There was switching of languages of smaller tribes to Quechua, but it is difficult to distinguish the tribes which speak Quechua proper from the 'Quechuaized' tribes whose former languages leave traces on their Quechua, and thus contribute to dialect diversity, as did mitimaes (*Inca shifting of populations* — so that inhabitants of politically recalitrant villages, speaking non-Inca languages, were relocated in the midst of politically conforming, Quechua speaking villages). The diversity, however, is not great among the Quechua dialects proper, or between these and the 'Quechuaized' tribes.

The number of dialects is also difficult to adduce since not only do various tribes speak different Quechua dialects, but individual villages have local variants in addition, due in part to mitimaes (see above). Mason, whom later writers have followed, groups Quechua into regional groups. Mason also believes that it is probable that no Quechua dialects, however diverse, are ever mutually unintelligible — at least not so for neighboring dialects. The dialect of Cuzco serves as standard; the dialects of Ayacucho province are said to be the most divergent (see now Gary Parker's Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University). Names listed for Quechua dialects are, for the most part, the names of the villages or provinces in which they are spoken; some are names of tribes, particularly in the case of tribes which originally did not speak Quechua. Since systematic dialect surveys have not been made, the listing of geographic groups as dialects is arbitrary. McQuown gives the following list after Mason and others:

Chinchaysuyo (Northern Quechua) group: Ayacucho, Junin, and four marked as extinct: Huanuco, Ancas (Ancash), Cajamarca, Chachapoya.

Tahuantisuyo (Southern Quechua, Cuzcoan) group: Cuzco (Aya(r)marca, Anta, Cuzc, Equeco, Huaroc, Huayllacan, Inca, Mara, Mayo, Poque, Quehuar, Quilliscachi, Quispicanchis, Sanco, Tampo), Cavina, Chilque (Aco, Cuyo, Papre), Lare, Quechua, Paucartambo, Vilcapampa, Yanahuara.

Costeño (Costal Quechua) group: Arequipa (Quechua, Costeño).

McQuown lists as co-ordinate with the three dialect groups above the following which are for the most part spoken beyond the borders of Peru: Quiteño (Quechua), spoken in Colombia and Ecuador; Boliviano (Quechua), spoken in south highlands Peru, Bolivia, Chile and Argentina; Argentino (Quechua, Cuzco, Tucumano), spoken in Argentina; Almaguero, spoken in Colombia; Ingano (Inca), spoken in Colombia and Ecuador; Quijo (Napo), spoken in Ecuador; Canelo (Loreto), spoken in Ecuador; Maina, spoken in Peru and Ecuador; Tuichi, spoken in Bolivia; Santiago del Estero, spoken in Argentina; and three spoken in Peru only: Chasutino, Lamanyo (Lamisto), and Ucayali (Quechua).

Carolyn Orr (Ecuador Quichua Clause Structure, Studies in Ecuadorian Indian Languages: I, S.I.L., Norman, 1962) gives the following dialects, divided into two groups, for Ecuador: Highland or Mountain: Agato (Imbabura Province), Calderon (Pichincho Province), Salasaca (Trinqurahua Province), Colta (Chinborazo Province), Cuenca (Azuay Province), Saraguro (Loja Province); Lowland or Jungle: Dos Rios (Nago Province), Puyo Pongo (Pastaza Province).

(2) Aymará (Aimara) is spoken by more than 600,000 people in Peru and Bolivia, only two-thirds of their estimated population in the mid-nineteenth century. Specifically, Aymara is spoken in the southern part of the Titicaca plateau of the central Andes between the eastern Cordillera Real and the western Maritime Cordillera, and southward to Poopó Lake and the Uyani salt marshes. Aymara was formerly distributed over a much greater area, but suffered as a result of Inca expansion in the 15th century.

The following are listed as dialects of, or tribes which speak Aymara: Lupaca (Lupacca), the dialect generally preferred for literary use; Collahuaya; Charca (only part of this tribe, however, speak Aymara); and five which are listed as possibly extinct: Colla (Collao), Cana, Canchi, Ubina, Collagua. (See now Martha Hardman's Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1962, concerned with an enclave of Aymara speakers living in the central highlands, near Lima, Peru.)

Group Three of the Andean Division

This group consists of two little known families, Cahuapana and Zaparoan, within which Greenberg includes some languages not always classified as Zaparoan.

Zaparoan Family

Numerous tribes of northern Peru and adjacent Ecuador, often ambiguously identified and now nearly all extinct, have been listed as speaking Zaparoan languages. Since little linguistic information is available on Zaparoan it is impossible to say whether all the tribes named were actually Zaparoan-speaking, whether Zaparoan is actually a language family, or where language boundaries exist — or existed within it. The tribal names are usually divided into from three to five groups; we list below each group as though it represented a single, separate language.

(1) Coronado; the principal tribes of this group, Coronado and Oa, are extinct.

(2) Omurano (Roamaina) may have included besides Pinche, the Arasa (Arazo), Pava, Habitoa, Uspa, and Zapa (but Zapa may only be another name for the Shapra, who speak a dialect of Candoshi, listed in another division of the Andean-Equatorial phylum).

(3) Andoa, divided into the following five sub-groups, may actually have represented that many languages: (a) Andoa, including Guallpayo and Guasaga, all extinct (Murato sometimes listed in this subgroup is a dialect of Candoshi), (b) Gae (Siaviri), extinct, (c) Semigae (Shimigae), with over half a dozen other tribes, mostly extinct, (d) Iquito, including besides the Iquito, of whom there are perhaps 500 individuals in the Amazon basin west of Iquitos, Peru, the Maracana and the extinct Auve, (e) Asaruntoa.

(4) Zaparo, the few remaining speakers of which are bilingual in Quechua, perhaps includes (besides a number of extinct tribes) Arabela, still spoken by older people among a group living on the Arabela River in northern Peru.

(5) Sabela (Tuey, Auca, Huarani) is spoken in two dialects, Warani and

Ashiri, by a few hundred people in northeastern Ecuador.

Cahuapanan Family

The Cahuapanan (Kahuapana, Cawapanan Maina) family occupies a small region to the east of the Jivaro, between the Huallaga and Porto River, in north central Peru.

Cahuapanan group:

(1) Cahuapana and Concho (Chonzo) are possibly dialects of the same language; Concho is probably extinct.

Cheberoan group:

(2) Chebero (Xevero, Xebero, Jebero, Xihuila) is spoken by about 1,000 people.

(3) Chayahuita (Chaui, Chawi) includes Chayahuita (Chaui, Chayavita, Tsaawi), with 3,000 to 5,000 speakers and Yamorai (Balsapuertino).

(4) Ataguate.

Group Four of the Andean Division

This group consists of four language isolates and one language family of two members.

Xibito-Cholon Family

Xibito (Hibito), which became extinct about 1825, may have been a dialect of the same language as Cholon, also extinct.

Sec (Tallán, Sechura) Language Isolate

On the basis of 40 words published in 1864 Sec, formerly spoken in western Ecuador, is sometimes placed in the Yunca-Puruhan phylum of Macro-

Chibchan. A number of names of other tribes are often listed with Sec, which may have represented dialects of the same language or sister languages of a larger family.

Catacao Language Isolate

Catacao, still spoken in western Ecuador inland from the former Sec area, may be a sister language of Sec, in which case Catacao would be a member of a language family rather than a language isolate.

Leco Language Isolate

Leco (Lecan, Leka, Lapalapa, Chuncho, Aleniano) is spoken in Bolivia to the west of Lake Titacaca, by about two dozen people.

Culle and Colan Language Isolates

Culle and Colan, formerly spoken in Peru, are probably extinct.

Group Five of the Andean Division

This group consists only of Simacu, a language which may still be spoken in Peru. A number of extinct tribes, as the Urarina and Itucale, have been reported to have spoken related languages, but conflicting classifications of these also appear; apparently data are lacking to determine whether these were sister languages of Simaca, in one language family.

Jivaro Division of the Andean-Equatorial Macro-Phylum

Greenberg includes in this division of the Andean Equatorial macro-phylum five language isolates — Candoshi, Cofan, Esmeralda, Yaruro, and Jivaro.

Jivaro Language Isolate

Jivaro (Jibaro, Xivaro, Shuara) is spoken in the jungles of southeastern Ecuador and northwestern Peru by over twenty thousand people. Many subdivisions of the Jivaro have been listed as speaking different dialects or even different languages, but on the basis of fieldwork Turner (IJAL 24.87) reports only four main dialect divisions: Ecuadorian Jivaro (Jivaro); Huambisa (Huambiza, Wambisa), spoken by over 3,000 people; Achuara (Achuale); and Aguaruna, with 15,000 speakers. Aguaruna is said to be the most divergent, 'possibly to the point of being a separate language'. The various Jivaro subtribes speak or spoke one or another of these four dialects — e.g. the extinct Palta and their Malacato subdivision, and the Bolona probably spoke the Ecuadorian dialect; the Candoa are listed by Mason as a sub-division of Huambisa.

Candoshi Language Isolate

Candoshi (Kandoshi, Candoxi) is spoken by two thousand people between the Morona and Postaza Rivers in the northern part of Peru. The Candoshi tribe is divided into two groups, the Murato and the Shapra. According to Cox (IJAL 23.127), "The Murato dialect is only slightly different from the Shapra: they are mutually intelligible." Murato and perhaps Shapra had been classified in the Zaparoan family, but Cox confirms Tessman's earlier conclusion that it showed no similiarity to Zaparoan. Greenberg classifies Candoshi as more closely related to Jivaro than either is to any other language.

Esmeralda Language Isolate

Esmeralda (Atacame), formerly spoken on the coast of Ecuador, became extinct in the nineteenth century. Esmeralda is classified by most sources other than Greenberg as belonging to the Macro-Chibchan phylum.

Yaruro Language Isolate

Yaruro, spoken in southern Venezuela, is said by Mason to be almost extinct, but recent estimates give the Yaruro population as between 3,500 and 5,000. Yaruro is sometimes classified as belonging to the Macro-Chibchan phylum; Jijón y Camaaño, for example, lists a Paleo-Chibchan subdivision of Macro-Chibchan consisting of Yaruro and Esmeralda.

Cofan Language Isolate

Cofan (Kofane), an extinct language of Ecuador, has also been previously classified as belonging to the Macro-Chibchan phylum.

Macro-Tucanoan Division of the Andean-Equatorial Macro-Phylum

Greenberg includes in a Macro-Tucanoan division of the Andean-Equatorial phylum the Tucanoan family, the Catuquina family, and eight language isolates: Tukuna, Muniche, Auaque, Caliana, Macu, Yuri, Canichana, and Movima in one subdivision and in the other only the Puinave family.

Tucanoan (Betoyan) Family

Tucanoan languages are spoken in Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Brazil by as many as ten thousand people. Lacking adequate linguistic information, Tucanoan languages and dialects have been classified on a geographic basis only, with first a division into Eastern and Western, each with subdivisions consisting of single tribes or small groups of adjacent tribes, some of which are further subdivided into sibs which are assumed to speak separate dialects.

We list below as though they were separate languages only the major subdivisions of Eastern and Western Tucanoan, after Mason and McQuown. Those subdivisions which include more than one tribe may, of course, be more than one language, but it is equally possible that two or more of the subdivisions actually represent dialects of a single language. Tribes and/or sibs subsumed under each language may not be dialectally differentiated and some of these subgroups may be extinct.

Eastern Tucanoan:

(1) Cubeo, including the subdivisions Holona and Hahanana, is spoken by a thousand people in Colombia, a figure which may not include the Bahuna and the Coroa (Coroua, Corowa), also in Colombia, or the Baniua and Julaimaua in Brazil.

(2) Tucano-Tuyuca includes the Tucano (Takuna, Tukana) proper, including the Arapaso, Neenoa, Yohoroa (Curaua) and Uina Tapuyo sub-tribes or sibs; the Tuyuca, who may also have been a Tucano sub-tribe, including the Bara and Tsola subdivisions; the Wanana (Uanana, Anana), including the Waiana (Uaiana), Uaicana, Piratapuyo and Uainana subdivisions; the Carapana; the Wasona (Uasona); and the Pamoa.

(3) Buhagana includes the Omoa, Sara, Doa, Tsaina, Tsoloa and Yaba sibs or subtribes of Buhagana proper as well as the Macuna and Hobacana.

(4) Desana (Dessana), estimated to have had a population of between 800 and 1100 in 1900, possibly including the then few Yapua.

(5) Cueretu, possibly including the Cashiita (Caxiita).

(6) Yahuna, who numbered 150 to 200 in 1900, including the Opaina and Datuana sibs.

(7) Boloa

(8) Erulia

Western Tucanoan:

(9) Pioje-Sioni, including the Sioni and the Encabellado. Divisions of the latter, at different periods, were called Píoj́e (Pioche), Secoya-Gai, Campuya, Santa Maria, Guaciguaje, Cieguaje, Macaguaje and Amaguaje; some of these names have also been used as synonyms of Encabellado. A group found in this century, in a late 19th century location of the Macaguaje, have also been called Sioni.

(10) Correguaje-Tama, included the Ayrico, who were perhaps a subdivision of the Tama.

(11) Coto (Payagua), with a population of 500.

A number of other groups, as the Palananoa, Bahukiwa and Corocora Tapuya, have been listed as Tucano-speaking without reference to which other tribes, if any, they might be particularly associated with. Some or all of such names may be merely synonyms for groups already listed above.

Catuquina (Catukina) Family

Languages of the Catuquina family are spoken by perhaps 2000 people in eastern Brazil. The location of dialect and language boundaries between the numerous Catuquina tribes and subtribes is unknown; Mason and McQuown follow

Nimuendaju's presentation of the fullest list of tribal names, as given below.

(1) Catuquina (Catukina), with a population of 500 to 1,000, including the Pidadiapa and Cutiadiapa (Kutia-Dyapa)

(2) Canamari, with a population of 250 to 500

(3) Catawishi (Catauichi)

(4) Bendiapa

(5) Paraua (Parawa)

(6) Tauare (Tawari), including the Caduquilidiapa (Cadekili -Dyapa) and Uadioparanindiapa (Wadyo-Paraniñ-Dyapa),

(7) Tucundiapa (Mangeroma, Tucano Dyapa, Tucun Dyapá)

(8) Amenadiapa (Amena Dyapa)

(9) Canadiapa (Cana Dyapa)

(10) Hondiapa (Mondiapo, Hon-Dyapá)

(11) Marodiapa (Marö Dyapa)

(12) Ururudiapa (Ururu-Dyapa)

(13) Uiridiapa (Wiri-Dyapa)

(14) Cadiudiapa

(15) Burue

(16) Catuquino (Catukino).

Tucuna Language Isolate

Tucuna (Ticuna) is spoken by an estimated 15,000 people in northwestern Brazil.

Muniche Language Isolate

The Muniche (Munichi, Otonabe), also apparently called Paranapura from their location on the Paranapura River (not to be confused with the Chebero-speaking Paranapura who joined them) had at one time two subtribes, the Churitura (Churitana) and the Muchimo, which may have been dialectally differentiated. It is known that 200 Muniche were alive in 1925, and the language may be still spoken.

Auaque Language Isolate

Auaque (Auake, Arutani), spoken in Venezuela, may now be extinct.

Caliana Language Isolate

Caliana, spoken near the Auaque in Venezuela, may also be extinct.

Macu Language Isolate

Macu, spoken in the Guiana area of Brazil, in the same general region as Auaque and Caliana, is probably still spoken.

Yuri Language Isolate

Yuri (Juri), possibly the Juri described by Metraux as an Arawakan tribe of the left, middle Amazon, is extinct.

Caninchana Language Isolate

Caninchana is spoken by perhaps twenty-five poeple in northeastern Bolivia on the Brazilian border.

Movima Language Isolate

Movima (Mobima) is spoken by two thousand people in Venezuela.

Puinave Family

Greenberg places the Puinave (Macu, Guaipunavo) family as the unique member of a subdivision of Macro-Tucanoan, opposed to a subdivision consisting of all the other members of Macro-Tucanoan. The languages of the Puinave family are spoken in northwestern Brazil and adjacent Colombia. Only two names are given for larger Puinave-speaking groups — Puinave and Macu (a different Macu than the Macu language isolate above). Macu is a cover term for a number of small forest-dwelling groups, named for the regions in which they were encountered, who are said to speak very 'differentiated' dialects, which are not actually known to be 'linguistically related'. Hence, Macu may represent more than one language, and if so, one or more of the languages may not belong to the Puinave family.

(1) Puinave, including the Western subgroups: Bravos and Guaripa; and an eastern subgroup: Mansos.

(2) Macu, including such groups as the Nadobo, Papuri, Kerari, Tikie, and Yapooa.

Equatorial Division of the Andean-Equatorial Macro-phylum

The Equatorial division of the Andean-Equatorial Macro-phylum includes nine language families — Arawakan, Tupi, Timote, Cariri, Mocoa, Salivan, Zamucoan, Guahibo-Pamigua and Yuracarean — and four language isolates — Tuyuneri, Cayuvava, Otomaca-Taparita and Trumai.

Arawakan Family

Arawakan is the largest language family in the New World, both in geographical extent and in number of languages and dialects. A hundred-odd Arawakan languages — many of them extinct or on the verge of extinction —

are spoken in widely scattered areas from Honduras, British Honduras, and Guatemala to the Gran Chaco, and from the mouth of the Amazon to the eastern foothills of the Andes and beyond. The Mesoamerican forebears who spoke an Arawakan language called Island Carib were deported from St. Vincent in 1797; their descendents, now called Black Carib, continue to speak Island Carib in the countries mentioned above which have shorelines on the Gulf of Honduras. However, since the Black Carib have their provenience in the Carribean area, and since that area is counted as part of South America rather than Mesoamerica, we conclude that the Arawakan family is essentially restricted to South America.

The Orinoco and Rio Negro region of the Guiana-Venezuela- Brazil border-land may have been the original home of the Arawak, from which they were scattered primarily by the powerful Caribs.

Mason's statement that no comprehensive classification of Arawakan languages on a linguistic basis has ever been attempted is still true. All the over-all classifications of Arawakan base at least their major subgroupings on geographic areas. Douglas Taylor (IJAL, 1958) has classified the 'Northern' Arawakan languages on a linguistic basis. Taylor's lexico-statistical comparisons of these languages with half a dozen other Arawakan languages indicate groupings (historical developments) which cross-cut the major geographical groups. The languages compared by Taylor are, however, too few to permit a revision of the over-all classification; hence, we repeat below the geographic classification as given by Mason and McQuown — except for

Northern Arawakan, where we follow instead Taylor's linguistic classification. Comments on Taylor's lexicostatistical comparisons are given at the place in the list where the languages compared occur.

The total number of languages in the Arawakan family is in the neighborhood of 100 (a figure which must be regarded as only vaguely approximate since so little is known concerning the bulk of the Arawakan languages and/or dialects), of which most of those still spoken have only a few hundred speakers each, exceptions being Goajiro with some 40,000 speakers, Campa with 33,000, Piro and Machiguenga 10,000 each, Tereno 5,000.

Northern Branch:

Island Carib Subgroup:

(1) Island Carib (Black Carib, Cabre, Caberne, Calino, Calinya, Çallinago, Calinyaku, Karĭphuna) is still spoken in British Honduras, Guatemala and Honduras by some 30,000 people. Mutually intelligible dialects mentioned by Taylor (1958) are: Stann Creek, Hopkins, Seine Bight, Punta Gorda, and Barranco in British Honduras; and Livingston, Truxillo, and Roatán Island in Honduras and Guatemala. Island Carib was formerly spoken in the Lesser Antilles (except Trinidad), surviving in Dominica and St. Vincent until about 1920.

Ta-Arawakan Subgroup:

(2) Lokono (Arawak), still spoken in British Guiana and French Guiana, was formerly spoken also in adjacent areas, including Trinidad

(3) Taino, formerly spoken in the Greater-Antilles and the Bahamas is extinct.

Other names listed in earlier sources as Northern Arawakan languages or dialects — such as Ciguayo, Igneri, Lucayo, and Sub-Taino — represent not so much local varieties of the languages listed above as interpretations of the probably confused impressions of the first Europeans to visit the area.

(4) Goajiro (Guajiro) is spoken in the Goajiro Peninsula of Colombia and Venezuela by some 40,000 people, of whom 10,000 are in Venezuela. The Goajiro constitute the largest Indian group in Colombia. A number of tribes have been listed as speaking Goajiro dialects that do not even speak an Arawakan language; for example, the Chimila speak a Choco language and the Cosina speak an unidentified non-Arawakan language. Nothing is known of the language of the long extinct Tairona, but the Tairona are sometimes assumed to ancestral to the Chimila who, as already mentioned, speak a language belonging to another family than Arawakan.

(5) Paraujano (Parauhano), spoken in Venezuela, is placed by Taylor with Goajiro in a separate subgroup of the Ta-Arawakan subgroup. This indication of a particularly close relationship between them may imply that they are dialects of one language. Toa and Alile have been listed as dialects of Paraujano.

(6) Guanebucan of Colombia, usually subgrouped with Goajiro, is not mentioned by Taylor.

Two extinct languages of Trinidad are mentioned by Taylor but not placed within the framework of his classification:

(7) Jaoi

(8) Shebayo.

Northwestern Group (= the languages of the Northwestern group of the geographically Northern group which were not classified by Taylor as part of the Northern Branch, above):

Caquetioan Subgroup:

(9) Caquetio, including Axagua and Guaicari, in Venezuela

(10) Achagua, in Venezuela and Colombia, including Tayagua (Tayaga), Yaguai, Chucuna, Amarizana, Chapan, Masivaribeni, and Caouri

(11) Tecua, formerly spoken in Colombia

(12) Motilon (Motilone) of Catatumbo and Riode Oro (but not the Motilon of the Sierra de Perija, who speak a Carib language); the total Motilon population is estimated as 7,000, but the figure for the Arawakan Motilon is not distinguished from that for the Carib Motilon.

Guayupean Subgroup, all of which were formerly spoken in Colombia:

(13) Guayupe

(14) Eperigua (Operigua)

(15) Sae

Piapocoan Subgroup:

(16) Piapoco (Dzaze), spoken in Colombia, is very closely related to Catapolitani and Guinao of the Northern Amazon Group according to Taylor's lexicostatistical comparisons.

(17) Mitua, in Colombia.

Northern Amazon Group

More Arawakan languages are assigned to this group, centered in the

Colombia - Venezuela - Brazil border regions of the Rio Negro area, than to any other geographic group.

Arauan Subgroup:

(18) Araua (Aruan, Arua), spoken or formerly spoken in Brazil, apparently not the same as the Araua listed in a separate Aruan group below.

Palicuran Subgroup:

(19) Palicur (Palijur) with perhaps 500 speakers in Brazil and possibly others in British Guiana

(20) Marawan (Maraon) is extinct.

Rio Branco Subgroup:

(21) Uapichana (Wapishana, Wapitxano, Vapidiana) is spoken by 2,500 in British Guiana and 1,500 in Brazil; the Amariba dialect formerly spoken in British Guiana is extinct.

(22) Atorai (Dauri), including Maiopitian (Maopityan, Mapidian), in British Guiana and Brazil

Orinoco Subgroup:

(23) Guinao (Temomoyamo, Temomeyeme, Quinhao, Inao), including Guaniare, in Venezuela. By Taylor's lexicostatistical comparison, Guiano is very closely related to Piapoco of the Northwestern Group and Catapolitani of the Rio Negro subgroup of the Northern Amazon Group.

(24) Maipure (Mejepure) was spoken in Venezuela.

(25) Mauacua (Mawacua), in Colombia and Venezuela

(26) Yavitero (Paraene), in Venezuela and Colombia

Indeterminate Subgroup:

(27) Baniva (Avani, Ayane, Abane), including Quirruba, in Venezuela and Colombia

(28) Bare, in Venezuela, and Barauna (Barauana, Barawana), in Brazil

(29) Arequena (Arekena, Warekena, Uariquena), spoken in Brazil, Colombia and Venezuela

(30) Cariaia (Cariaya), formerly spoken in Brazil.

Rio Negro Subgroup, Izaneni (Baniva) Division:

(31) Carutana is spoken in Brazil by 250 people, a figure which may not include all the groups listed as dialects: Jauarete (Yawarete Tapuya), Uadzoli (Wadzoli), Mapache, Urubu, Dzaui (Dzawi), Adaru, Arara, Baniva do Icana (Issana) and Jurupari (Yurupari Tapuya).

(32) Catapolitani, spoken in Brazil, is very closely related by Taylor's lexicostatistic evidence to Piapoco of the North-western Group and Gu inao of the Orinoco subgroup of the Northern Amazon Group.

(33) Cuati (Costi, Capite), in Brazil and Colombia

(34) Caua-Huhuteni, two dialects of one language spoken in Brazil

(35) Mapanai (Ira), in Brazil

(36) Moriuene (Moriwene, (Sucuriyu), in Brazil

(37) Paioariene (Payualiene, Pacu), in British Colombia

(38) Siuci (Siusi, Waliperi, (Ualiperi) and Ipeca (Cumata) in Brazil

Rio Negro Subgroup, Miritiparana Division:

(39) Cauyari (Caryari), spoken in Colombia

(40) Matapi, in Colombia

(41) Yucuna, in Colombia

(42) Menimehe, in Colombia

Rio Negro Subgroup, Mauaca Division:

(43) Adzaneni (Adiana, Tatu), in Colombia and Brazil

(44) Mandauaca (Mandawaca), in Brazil

(45) Masaca, in Venezuela

(46) Jabaana, in Brazil

(47) Masaca, in Brazil

Rio Negro Subgroup, Tarianan Division:

(48) Itayaine (Iyaine), in Brazil

(49) Tariana, 1,000 speakers, in Brazil

Rio Negro Subgroup, Japura 'A' Division:

(50) Uainuma, (Wainuma) Brazil, Colombia

Rio Negro Subgroup, Japura 'B' Division:

(51) Cauichana (Cayuishana, Cawishana), spoken in Brazil

(52) Jumana (Chimana), in Brazil

(53) Passe, Colombia, in Brazil

(54) Manao, in Brazil, now extinct.

Rio Negro Subgroup, Uirina Division:

(55) Uirina, in Brazil

Pre-Andine Group:

Amazonian Subgroup:

(56) Maraua, Brazil

(57) Uaraicu (Uraicu, Araicu), Brazil

Cutinanan Subgroup:

(58) Cutinana, Brazil

(59) Cuniba

(60) Cujisenajeri (Cujigeneri, Cuchitineri), Brazil

Jurua-Purus Subgroup:

(61) Canamari (Kanamari) 500 speakers, Brazil.

(62) Catuquina

(63) Catiana
(64) Inapari
(65) Ipurina (Kangite) 1,000 speakers in Brazil, two dialects — Ipurina and Cangutu

(66) Cacharari

(67) Uainamari, Brazil

(68) Maniteneri, Brazil

Montanya (Chuncho) Subgroup:

(69) Campa (Atiri) 33,000 speakers (1940). All dialects are spoken in eastern Peru. Listed as dialects are: Anti, Antaniri (Unconino), Camatica, Campa, Catongo, Chicheren, Quimbiri, Quirinairi, Pangoa, Tampa, Ugunichiri, and Unini. In Taylor's lexicostatistic comparisons, Campa's highest percentage of shared cognates (67 percent) was with Piro, in the same geographic subgroup.

(70) Piro, 10,000 speakers in Peru. Dialects include: Simirinch and Chontaquiro. Piro is very closely related to Campa, see above.

(71) Machiguenga (Macheyenga, Amachengue) 10,000 speakers

(72) Masco (Moeno)

(73) Huachipairi (Amarakaire, Greachipari), 200 speakers

(74) Puncuri

(75) Sirimeri

(76) Pucpacuri.

Southern Group

South Bolivian Subgroup:

The nine languages of the Southern Group are spoken in Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay:

(77) Bolivia includes the dialect Mojo (Moxo, Morocosi) with 1,500 speakers of the Trimitarios subdialect; names of other subdialects are not available (perhaps the Ianaciano of the Mission of St. Ignacio de Moxos is a Mojo dialect) Baure (Chiquimiti), with 3,000 speakers, is also a dialect of Bolivia. Mojo is most closely related to Campa and Piro, but considerably less close to either than they are to each other, in Taylor's lexicostatistic comparison.

(78) Chiquito, including Paiconeca and Paunaca.

Paressi (Pareche, Ariti) Subgroup, with 500 speakers in Brazil:

Taylor's lexicostatistic comparisons included Ariti, not further identified as to which of the three languages or dialects of this subgroup was used in the comparisons. Ariti shared far more cognates with Mehinacu in the Xinguan subgroup, below, than with any other language compared, but Ariti probably does not belong in a genetic subgroup with Mehinacu since Ariti does not share the same high percentage of cognates with the Catapolitani - Piapoco-Guinao group that Mehinacu does, and Ariti's percentage of cognates shared with languages in the Northern branch are extremely low - far lower than any of the other percentages in Taylor's comparisons.

(79) Cachiniti (Cashiniti), including Uaimare (Waimare)

(80) Cozarini, with three subdivisions listed as Wild Cabishi, Paressi Cabishi, and Mahibarez

(81) Iranche (Irantxe), 250 speakers, in Brazil, with three dialects listed: Timalatia, Tahuru-ina, and Sacuriu-ina.

Saraveca Subgroup:

(82) Saraveca, spoken in Brazil and Bolivia.

Parana Subgroup:

Many of the speakers of Parana languages have replaced their original language by Guaicuru and hence are often listed as Guaicuru subdivisions.

(83) East Parana (Guana, Chuala, Chana) includes the Layana (Niguecactemigi) in Paraguay, Tereno (Terena, Etelena), 5,000 people in southwestern Mato Grosso, Brazil, Echoaladi (Chararana, Echenoana) in Paraguay, and Equiniquinao (Kinihĩnao) in Paraguay and Brazil.

(84) West Parana (Chane), spoken in Paraguay and Bolivia, includes the Izocenyo.

Xinguan Subgroup:

(85) Xingu dialects spoken in Brazil include Mehinacu (Minaco) with 100 speakers, Jaulapiti, Custenau, and Uaura (Aura, Waura) with 250 speakers. Mehiracu's

highest percentage of shared cognates was with Catapolitani and Piapoco, but the percentage was lower than the percentage they share with each other, and Mehinacu's percentage of cognates shared with Mojo was considerably higher than Catapolitani and Piapoco's percentage shared with Mojo. For comments on Mehinacu's relationship to Ariti, see the Paressi Subgroup, above.

Two additional groups of several languages each and three single languages are specifically included in Arawakan by Greenberg. These languages were not listed under any of the geographic groups above by Mason and McQuown since their Arawakan relationship had been questioned by one or another earlier source. Their listing here as separate Arawakan groups does not imply that they do not belong to groups listed above — i.e. their closest relationships are not with languages already listed — but rather that their inclusion in a group purely on the basis of their location would be meaningless.

Amuesha

(86) Amuesha (Amuexa) is spoken around the headwaters of the Pachitea and Ucayali Rivers in Peru. Estimates of the number of speakers vary from four thousand to nine thousand. Taylor presents some lexical comparisons between Amuesha and several other Arawakan languages in IJAL 20.240 ff.

Apolista

(87) Apolista (Lapacho, Lapachu) was formerly spoken in Bolivia.

Chamicuro (Chamicura)

(88) Chamicuro was formerly spoken in Peru. Apparently more than one language was called Chamicuro since some classifiers have listed Chamicuro as

a Panoan language and others as an Arawakan language.

Chapacuran-Uanham Group

The Chapacuran and Uanham (Wanyam) languages are spoken in northeastern Bolivia and adjacent Brazil.

Guapore Division, Chapacura Subgroup:

(89) Chapacura (Guapore, Guarayo, Tapacura, Huachi)

(90) Quitemoca (Kitemoca), including Napeca

(91) More (Iten, Guarayo), with 100 speakers includes Itoreauhip

Guapore Division, Uanham (Wanyam) Subgroup:

(92) Cabichi (Cabishi)

(93) Cujuna (Cuijana)

(94) Cumana, including Cutinaa

(95) Mataua (Matama)

(96) Urunumacan (Urunamacan)

(97) Uanham (Wanyam, Pawumwa), including Abitana

Madeira Division:

(98) Tora (Toraz), extinct

(99) Jaru, extinct

(100) Urupa (Txapacura), perhaps 250 speakers

(101) Pacas Novas (Pacahanovo)

Ocorono Division, all extinct:

(102) Ocorono (Rokorona), including Sansimoniano

(103) San Ignacio including Borija

(104) Herisobocono (Herisobocona)

Arauan Group

The Arauan languages are spoken in western Brazil, in the region of the Amazon headwaters, and may be only a more detailed listing of the Arauan Subgroup of the Northern Amazon Group.

(105) Culina (Kulino, Culinha, Cuniba, Kulina, Culino, Curina) is spoken in Brazil by some 500, and in Peru by about 75 speakers; Curia, Curiana and Culiña have been listed as Culina subgroups.

(106) Jamamadi (Yamadi), with the following listed as subgroups: Capana, Capinamari, Colo, Purupuru, Paumari (Curucuru, Pammari, Uaiai), and Juberi (Yuberi)

(107) Madiha

(108) Sewacu

(109) Cipo (Sipo).

Uru

Uru is also listed by Greenberg as a member of the Arawakan family. The Uru language, which is related to Chipaya, has been shown to share lexical similarities with Mayan languages and hence is classified by us as belonging to the Penutian phylum; however, the name Uru has been applied to more than one linguistic group, and Greenberg may have compared a different Uru.

Tupi Family

Tupi (Tupi-Guarani) languages form a language family which, next to the Arawakan, is the most widespread family in South America. With the exception of the Oyampi and Emrillon speakers who migrated to French Guiana in the eighteenth century, all languages of the family are spoken south of the Amazon River.

The classification of Tupi languages presented below follows that of Arion D. Rodrigues (IJAL 24.231-4), with additional information (largely in the form of additional tribal names) from the earlier Tupi classifications of Trager (1948), Mason (1950) and McQuown (1955), and with additional demographic information for some languages from Darcy Riberio (S.P.I. - Indian Protectorate Service, Brazil). Rodrigues' classification is based on lexicostatistics, with the following criteria for divisions (our labels): dialects of the same language have 81 percent or more shared cognates in the test list; languages in the same sub-branch have 60 percent or more shared cognates; languages in the same branch have 36 percent or more shared cognates; languages in different branches within the same family have 12 percent shared cognates.

Tupi-Guarani Branch (twenty languages):

Sub-branch I:

(1) Tupi-Guarani, a single language, is spoken in Brazil, Paraguay, Argentina, and Bolivia by over a million speakers. The Guarani dialect of Tupi-Guarani serves as a standard language of Paraguay, beside Spanish. According to Paul L. Garvin and Madeleine Mathiot (1956), "In rural areas, Guarani is spoken almost exclusively ... In the Asunción metropolitan area, which includes a large percentage of the country's population, both Guarani

and Spanish are used." Beside the Tupi-Guarani speakers in Paraguay (especially concentrated in the eastern and southern parts), in Argentina, Bolivia, and some inland Brazilian enclaves, there are groups lining the Brazilian coast from north to south in almost unbroken sequence. Rodrigues distinguishes seven dialects of Tupi-Guarani, (a) through (g), below.

(a) Tupi dialect, in two historical phases: Old Tupi or Tupinamba (the lingua geral), and Modern Tupi or Ñeengatú (Nheengatu, Coastal Tupian); the latter may possibly include a modern Potiguara (Pitonạra) variety spoken by five hundred to a thousand speakers. Names sometimes listed as Tupi dialects or languages seem rather to represent names of local groups of Tupinamba living in eastern Brazil in the 16th and 17th centuries; among such names are Amoipira, Apigapigtana, Araboiara, Aricobe, Caete, Muriapigtanga, Potiguara, Rariguara, Tamoia, Tamoio, Timimino, Tobajara, Tupina, Tupiniquin, and Viatin.

(b) Guarani dialect, spoken by an estimated one million people in Paraguay and by three or four thousand people in Brazil, is also known in two historical phases, Old Guarani and Avañeẽ or Modern Guarani. Synonyms of Guarani and names of local groups of various historical periods which have been listed as though speaking separate Guarani subdialects include: Carijo, Chandule, *Guaracaio (Itati), *Itatin, *Tobatin, *Guarambare, *Taiobe, *Taruma, *Arechane. (Names marked with an asterisk are marked as extinct, or possibly so, by McQuown or others).

(c) Kaiwa (Kaingua, Caingua, Cayua) dialect spoken in Brazil, Paraguay, and Argentina in at least two local varieties: Apapokuva (Apapocuva) and Mbia (Mbya). Other synonyms and names of local groups which have been listed under Kaiwa include: *Montese, Oguiva (Oguaiva, Oguana), *Tanygua, Carima, *Guayana, Panh, Terenoke, Cheiru, Avahuguai, Paiguassu, Yvytigua, Avachiripa, Catanduva, Jatahy, Apitere, Baticola, Baobera, Chiripa.

(d) Čiriguano (Chiriguano, Aba, Camba, Tembeta), dialect spoken by an estimated 20,000 persons in Bolivia and Argentina

(e) Tapiete (Tirumbae, Yanaigua) dialect, spoken in Bolivia and Paraguay.

(f) Izozó (Čané, Chané) dialect, spoken in Bolivia

(g) Guarayú dialect, spoken in Bolivia by 5,000 persons. Names of local groups which have been listed as though they spoke separate subdialects include: Itatin, Carabere, Araibayba, Moterecoa (Moperacoa), Varai, Pirataguari (Pitaquari), Cario, Quiriticoci.

Other subdialect, dialect, or variant names which were associated with Tupi-Guarani in previous classifications but not identifiable in terms of Rodrigues' classification include: *Poroquicoa (in Bolivia), *Palmer (in Bolivia and Paraguay), and *Ubegua (in Bolivia and Paraguay).

(2) Tenetehara, spoken in Brazil on both sides of the Gurupi River in the states of Pará and Maranhão by an estimated 2,000 to 3,500 people, has the following dialects:

(a) Tembé, spoken by an estimated 1,000 to 2,500 persons in the area along the Gurupi River from its origin to the mid-point along its length and on the Guamá River

(b) GwaŽaŽara (Guajajara), spoken by over 1,000 persons living on the Grajaú, Mearim, and Pindoré Rivers of Brazil's Maranhão State; closely associated with them are the Guajá (Ayaya, Wazaizara, Guaxare), with an estimated 100 to 250 persons living in small groups east of the forest of the Gurupi and upper Pindaré River in Maranhão

(c) Urubú (Urubus, Urubu), spoken by 500 to 1,000 persons living on two posts, one on either side of the Gurupi River in the states of Pará and Maranhão

(d) ManaŽe (Amanage, Manaxo, Manajo, Amanyé), spoken by less than 50 people on the Garratão and Ararandeuára Rivers, tributaries of the Capim, and on the Caiararé and Moju Rivers in the Brazilian state of Pará; Parakana (Parocana) is a variety of ManaŽe, spoken by 250 to 500 persons between the upper Jacundá and Tocantins Rivers in the state of Pará.

(e) Turiwara (Turiuara)

(f) Anambé

(g) Asurini, with from 250 to 500 speakers at the headwater of the Bacajá tributary of the middle Xingu River in the Pará State of Brazil is attested by Loraine Bridgeman (in press; unmentioned by Rodrigues).

The following names of local groups are listed in conjunction with the Tenetehara language by classifications prior to Rodrigues: He, Araquaia, *Nhengahiba, *Ararandeura, *Miranho, Cuperoban (Cubenepre, Cuperob, Cupelobo) *Jandiahi, *Pacajan (Pucaja), *Jacunda (Amiranha), and *Tapiraua (Anta).

(3) Oyampí (Oiumpian), spoken in the Amapá Territory of Brazil and

in the adjacent area of French Guiana, has the following dialects:

(a) Oyampí (Oiampi, Aipi), spoken in Amapá Territory and French Guiana; *Gamacom, also spoken in Amapá Territory and French Guiana, and Calina have been listed as though they were subdialects.

(b) Emérillon, spoken in French Buiana. Groups in the Amapá Territory of Brazil which have been mentioned as speaking Emériollon are: *Guaiapi, *Paiquipiranga (Parichy), *Cussari, and *Araguaju (Uruaguassu, Uaraguassu, Uruaguacu).

(4) Kawaíb (Cawahib, Cauaiua, Cauhib, Cabahyba, Jauareta-Tapiia), spoken by under 500 persons in the State of Amazonas and adjoining Rondônia Territory, Brazil, has the following dialects:

(a) Wirafed (Uirafed), reported to be spoken by less than 50 speakers (Darcy Riberio) in Rondônia Territory in the area of the canals of the Riosinho and Muqui tributaries of the Jiparaná River.

(b) Pawaté (Paranauat, Paranawat), with around 100 speakers in the Territory of Rondônia on the Muqui, Leitão, and Riosinho streams, tributaries of the Jiparaná (Machado) River, and also on the Sono River

(c) Parintintin, spoken by from 100 to 250 people who live on the Ipixuna River, a tributary of the Madeira in Amazonas State.

Mialát, a previously unknown dialect with only 16 speakers in 1938, on the upper Leitão River in Brazil, may also be a dialect of Kawaib, as may be Tacuatib (Tacuatip, Takuatép, Takwatib Eriwahun), spoken in the Territory of Rondônia.

The following additional names of local groups are listed by classifications prior to Rodrigues as though they represented separate dialects of Kawaib: Apairande, Odiahuibe, Tapechiche (Taipechiche) and *Catuquinaru.

(5) *Apiaká (Apiaca), spoken in the north of the Mato Grosso State of Brazil near the confluence of the São Manoel River; Tapiitin, *Pari-bɨ-tete, *Tepanhuna (Tapanhuna) and *Arino have been listed as dialects of Apiaká.

(6) Kamayurá (Camaiura, Kamayirá) is spoken by 100 to 250 people living next to Ipavu Lake, close to the Curisevu River, headwater of the Xingu in Mato Grosso State of Brazil.

(7) Awetɨ (Aueto, Auití, Aweti, Arauite, Arauine) is spoken by not more than 50 persons on the left side of the Curisevu River, a headwater of the Xingu in the Brazilian state of Mato Grosso.

(8) Tapirapé is spoken by 100 to 250 persons on the Tapirapé River, an eastern tributary of the Araguáia River in the state of Mato Grosso, Brazil.

(9) Šeta (Seta, Sheta, Cheta, Xeta, Aré), is spoken by 100 to 250 persons in the Brazilian state of Paraná in the Dourados mountains, valley of the Ivaí River beyond the Mourão area; other names which have been listed as synonyms for or dialects of Šeta are: Chocleng, Shocleng, Ivapare, Notobotocudo, Botocudo, and Pihtadyovoc.

(10) Pauserna (Guarayu-Ta) is spoken by around twenty-five persons in eastern Bolivia.

(11) Kayabí (Caiabi, Parua, Maquiri) is spoken by around 500 persons who formerly lived in the southeastern section of Amazonas State, Brazil, but are moving to the Manitsáua-assu River, tributary of the Xingu in Mato Grosso State, Brazil.

(12) Canoeiro (Ava, Abá, Canoe, Canoa) is spoken by a few groups living in the state of Goiás, Brazil, on the high ground between the Formosa River and the eastern branch of the Araguaia.

(13) Takuñapé.

Sub-branch II:

(14) Kokama (Cocama) is spoken by an estimated 10,000 persons in the general region where Peru, Colombia, and Brazil meet. The dialects of Kokama are:

(a) Kokama, spoken in Peru, Brazil and Colombia

(b) Kokamilla (Cocamilla, Pambadeque), formerly spoken in Peru

The *Xibitaona of Peru have also been listed as speaking Kokama.

(15) Omagua (Compeva) was formerly spoken in Peru and Brazil. Associated with Omagua in previous classifications are: *Curacirari (Curazicari, Curucicuri, Curuzicari), *Aizuare (Aissuari), and *Paguana (Paguara).

Sub-branch III:

(16) Guayakí (Guoyagui) is spoken in southeastern Paraguay.

Sub-branch IV:

(17) Maué (Mabue, Mawé, Maragua, Andirá, Arapium, Sataré) is spoken by various groups on the Andirá, Urupadi and Mamuru Rivers in the

region of the lower Madeira River in Amazonas, Brazil.

Sub-branch V:

(18) Munduruku (Mundurucu, Weidyenye, Paiquize, Pari, Caras Pretas) is spoken in the Brazilian state of Pará by 1,000 to 1,500 persons living on the mid and upper Tapajós River and in the canal system of the lower Madeira, Maué-Assu, Abacaxis and Canumã.

(19) Kuruáya (Caravare, Curuaia) was formerly spoken in the state of Pará, Brazil.

Sub-branch VI:

(20) Sirionó (Chori) is spoken by 5,000 persons in eastern Bolivia. The following names have been listed as though they were separate Sirionó dialects: Nyeoze-Nee, Tirinie, Jande, Curungua.

Yuruna (Jurunan) Branch (three languages):

Sub-branch I:

(21) Yuruna (Juruna, Iuruna) is spoken in the state of Para, Brazil by 500 to 1,000 people.

(22) Šipaya (Chipaia, Achipaie, Chipaya, Xipáya) was formerly spoken along the Irirí and Curuá tributaries of the middle Xingu in Para, Brazil.

Sub-branch II:

(23) Manitsawá (Mantizula, Manitsaua) was formerly spoken on the Manitsaua-missu tributary of the Upper Xingu in the state of Mato Grosso, Brazil. *Arupai (Urupaya) has been listed as a dialect of the same language.

(a) Ramarama and

(b) Ntogapid (Itogapuc).

(33) Urukú

(34) Urumí

(35) Arara.

Monde Branch (three languages, all spoken in the Rondônia Territory of Brazil):

(36) Mondé has two dialects:

(a) Mondé

(b) Sanamaikã (Sanamaica, Salamãi),

(37) Digüt

(38) Aruá has two dialects:

(a) Aruá

(b) Aruáši (Aruachi).

Purabora Branch (one language):

(39) Puruborá (Burubora) is spoken by 50 to 100 persons at the headwaters of the São Miguel River, a tributary on the right side of the Guaporé in the Brazilian Territory of Rondônia.

Timote Family

The Timote (Cuica-Timote) family is apparently composed of only two languages spoken in the highlands of Venezuela, but further linguistic investigation may reveal language boundaries between some of the numerous subgroups listed for each.

Arikem Branch (three Brazilian languages, all extinct):

(24) Arikem (Ariqueme) was spoken in Amazonas.

(25) Karitiana was spoken in Amazonas.

(26) Kabišiana (Cabichiana, Kabixiâna, Cabichinana, Capichana) was spoken in the Territory of Rondônia.

Tupari Branch (five languages):

(27) Tuparí is spoken by less than fifty persons on the right bank of the Branco River, a tributary of the left side of the Guaporé, in the Territory of Rondônia, Brazil.

(28) Guaratégaya (Koaratira, Guaratira, Amniapé, Mequéns, Kanoé, Guarategaja) is spoken in the Territory of Rondônia in Brazil.

(29) Wayoró (Uaioro, Wajaru), is spoken in the Territory of Rondônia, Brazil, in two dialects:

(a) Wayoró (Ayurú) and

(b) Apičum.

(30) Makurap (Macurap) is spoken along the Branco River, a tributary of the Guaporé River in the Territory of Rondônia, Brazil.

(31) Kepkiriwat (Quepiquiriquat) is spoken in the Territory of Rondônia, Brazil.

Ramarama (Romaraman) Branch (four languages):

The four Ramarama languages — all extinct — were spoken in the general area of southern Amazonas and Rondônia Territory of Brazil:

(32) Ramarama (Itanga) was spoken in two dialects:

(1) Cuica dialects are divided into four groups, Cuica proper, Escuquean, Tostoan and Jojoan. Almost a score of tribal names are subsumed under these four groups in sources reported on by Mason and McQuown.

(2) Timote dialects have been divided into five groups, Timote proper, Migurian (Chama), Mocochi (Torondoyan), Mocotan (Mukutu, Escaguey) and Tapanoan. Almost seventy tribal names are subsumed under these five groups in Mason and McQuown.

McQuown lists as dialects of, or possible dialects of , a third Cuica-Timote language almost as many names as those listed under Timote, but most of these are listed in other sources as subtribes of tribes assigned to Cuica or Timote — e.g., the Monay, Chejende, Carache, Burubusay and Siquisaye are said to be subtribes of the Cuica (BAE-B 143, Vol. 4, pp. 353-4).

Cariri Family

Languages of the Cariri family were spoken in east central Brazil. One dialect of Cariri — Camuru — may still be spoken; all the other Cariri dialects and the Sapuya language are extinct.

(1) Cariri, differentiated into dialects which are listed as Quipea (Kipea), Camuru, Dzubucua and Pedra Branca.

(2) Sapuya (Sapuia)

(3) Pancararú (Pankaru, Pancaru, Pankaravu, Pankaroru) is sometimes classified as a Cariri language, sometimes as a language isolate. Pancararu is spoken on the São Francis River in northern Bahia, Brazil by 2,000 people.

Mocoa Family

Languages of the Mocoa (Coche, Camsa) family are or were spoken in southwestern Colombia.

(1) Quillacinga is extinct.

(2) Sebondoy is said by Mason to be still spoken, but only by some of the 1,700 Sebondoy.

(3) Patoco (Pastoco) is extinct.

Salivan Family

Salivan (Saliban, Piaroan) languages are spoken in south central Venezuela. The relationship between these languages may be more remote than a family relationship — Brinton found no similarity between Piaroa and Saliva.

(1) Piaroa is reported to be spoken by about 12,000 people.

(2) Macu (different than the Macu in the Puinave family, and the Macu language isolate, listed above).

(3) Saliva, formerly spoken in Venezuela and Colombia, is extinct.

The Duniberrenai in Venezuela are also listed in some sources as speaking a Salivan language, but without indication as to whether their speech represents a dialect of one of the three languages listed above, or a fourth Salivan language.

Zamucoan Family

The Zamucoan (Samucan) family is found in Bolivia and Paraguay in the northern Chaco. In spite of the numerous groups listed as Zamucoan-speaking, the Zamucoan family may consist of only two languages — Northern Zamucoan and Southern Zamucoan — or Zamucoan may even be a single language (as language isolate rather than a family). Mason reports that "Even the major divisions, apparently, do not differ greatly, and some of the names may be synonyms, or merely bands without linguistic differentiation."

(1) Northern Zamucoan includes such groups as the Zamuco proper, Cucarate, Moro ('remnants of the Morotoco and Guarañoco'), Poturero, Satienyo (Zatieño), and Tsiracua.

(2) Southern Zamucoan (Chamacoco) includes such groups as Caipotorade, Imono, Tunacho and Chamacoco proper, including its subdivisions Ebidoso, Horio and Tumereha.

Guahibo-Pamigua Family

Languages of the Guahibo-Pamigua family are spoken in central and eastern Colombia, with the Guahiban branch extending into Venezuela. There are two branches.

Pamiguan branch (in central Colombia):

(1) Pamigua (Bamigua), extinct.

(2) Tinigua, still spoken by a small group.

Guahiban branch (Colombia east of W 70° and Venezuela):

(3) Guahibo (Guaigua, Guayba, Guajibo, Wahibo, Goahivo, Goahiva) is spoken in Colombia by 10,000 to 20,000 people, and in Venezuela by between 5,000 and 20,000 people. Guahibo dialects include:

(a) Chiricoa, with two subdialects: Chiricoa, in Colombia and Venezuela; and Sicuane, in Colombia only.

(b) Cuiba, with three subdialects in Venezuela and Colombia: Cuiba, possibly extinct, Mella, and Ptamo

(c) Yamu, in Venezuela and Colombia

(4) Churoya, with two dialects:

(a) Churoya (Churuya)

(b) Bisanigua

(5) Cunimía, in Colombia with two dialects:

(a) Canimia (Cunimía)

(b) Guayavero (Guayabero).

Yuracarean Family

Yuracarean (Yurucare, Yurujure, Yuruyure) languages are spoken in central Bolivia:

(1) Soloto (Eastern Yuracare)

(2) Mansinyo (Mansiño, Western Yuracare), Andean slopes. Oromo, now extinct, was probably a dialect of Mansinyo.

Tuyuneri Language Isolate

Tuyuneri (Tuyoneri, Pucapacuri) is spoken in Peru.

Otomaca-Taparita Language Isolate

Otomamaca, formerly spoken in southern Venezuela, is extinct. Taparita has been variously listed as an alternate name for Otomaca, a variety of Otomaca, and — if synonomous with Taparito — a separate language isolate.

Cayuvava Language Isolate

Cayuvava (Kayubaba, Cayawabas, Cayuaba, Chacobo) is spoken in Bolivia by less than 100 people.

Trumai Language Isolate

The Trumai (Tramalhys) language is spoken in Brazil; in 1957 there was a single village on the right bank of the lower Culuene River; this village was decimated by a flu epidemic and by 1962 the Trumai were reduced to less than ten individuals, according to Bridgeman, who has done fieldwork among them.

XIII. SOUTH AMERICAN LANGUAGES WITH UNDETERMINED PHYLUM AFFILIATIONS

Nearly all of the 'unclassified' South American languages listed by Mason and McQuown which have not been assigned to one of the macro-phyla above are extinct. For most of them not enough data was ever recorded to have made classification on a comparative linguistic basis possible at any time. There remain, however, a few languages still spoken in South America for which relationships to other languages have not yet been postulated. This does not mean that wider relationships for these languages have been sought and not found; they have simply not been sought. The unclassified languages of South America are not just 'unclassified' — they are unknown.

There may be small groups of speakers of many more of the unknown languages of South America than those few in Brazil listed below.

Aricapu (Arikapu, Maxubi) is still spoken by between fifty and one hundred people at the headwaters of the Branco River, a tributary on the right margin of the Guaporé, in the Territory of Rondônia, Brazil.

Baena (Baenna, Mbae-una) is still spoken by less than two dozen people on a S.P.I. post in the state of Bahia, Brazil.

Juma (Yuma, Arara) is still spoken on tributaries of the Purus River in the state of Amazonas, Brazil.

Natu is still spoken by a few people in Pacatuba, Sergipe, Brazil.

Hishkaryana is spoken by 120 people along the Nhamunda River in northern Brazil.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGES

1.6. Large maps (as wall maps) of American Indian languages may be taken as an index of classificatory consensus among scholars in either one of two senses. On the one hand, the classification may represent the views of a single scholar whose impact on other scholars through vivid cartographic representation is such that other scholars tend, for some time, to voice their agreements with some parts of the single scheme rather than their dissent from other parts of it. On the other hand, the classification may represent the consensus of a group of scholars each of whom clearly appears, in his separate journal articles and other publications, to be in conflict with (or in controversy with) one or another scholar in the group which agrees, as a whole, upon a general classification that will reasonably reflect the results of comparative work among the American Indian languages mapped for a given period. This fact is here stated in general; though details of conflict and controversy over classifications are not given here, the methodical basis of differences are not left wholly unmentioned. But the main purpose of this report is to index the consensus successively reflected in three successive maps of American Indian languages.

Two decades ago, the Voegelins compiled a colored Map of North American Indian Languages which had only one predecessor, according to George L. Trager (IJAL 11.186, 1945):

"The only previously issued comprehensive map of the languages north of Mexico was first compiled by J. W. Powell to accompany his Indian Linguistic Families in BAE-R7 (1885-6), appearing in 1891. The same map, with minor changes and corrections, was issued as Smithsonian Miscellaneous Publication No. 7, in 1906, being intended to go with the then projected Handbook of American Indians, issued in 1912 as BAE-B30. In 1915 a further revision (by the staff of BAE) was issued as Miscellaneous Publication No. 11, with another revision in 1926. (I have seen the 1891 and 1906 versions.) Powell's map was based, of course, on his own classification of languages, a classification that was excellent in its restraint, and founded on the available knowledge of the day. But much has been done since in bringing together what seemed to Powell to be separate families of languages, and many of us have felt the need of a new map."

What seemed to Powell to be separate language families were, of course, separate language families. For more than half a century after Powell, some comparative work continued to be concerned with reconstruction within a given family, with problems of intrafamily connections (e.g. within Uto-Aztecan and within Tanoan, each viewed as separate families, each reconstructable in great detail as a parental proto-language), but some work exceeded this scope. What was new or revolutionary (after Powell) was the search for the relatively fewer cognates that were thought to attest the interfamily connections between separate language families. The usual term, 'reduced', has been misleading when it suggested that the Powell classification was one of branches of language families which were later given their proper place *qua* branches, thereby reducing the number of language families. Instead, the number of language families really remained the same, but some were found to be remotely related to others (e.g. the two parent languages of the Uto-Aztecan family and the Tanoan family, respectively, turned out to be genetically related in a phylum called Aztec-Tanoan).

Powell has been credited with being restrained or overly cautious. His thorniest problem, and ours, can be stated as a question: how to classify what have already been identified as language isolates (e.g. Basque in Europe — single languages which are not daughter languages of any language family composed of two or more daughter languages)? Sometimes Powell's map kept apart as a language isolate what has subsequently been included in one or another linguistic phylum — but still as a language isolate within a particular phylum. And just once (or perhaps twice) one of Powell's language isolates (Kiowa) turned out, on later investigation, to be a more or less divergent daughter language in a language family that had been recognized by Powell (Tanoan).

After all that had been written about the Bureau of American Indian activity headed by Powell, it seems to us that the 'chief' was neither restrained nor overly cautious, neither bold nor irresponsible. If he went too far in a single instance in classifying two language isolates (Cayuse and Molale) as daughter languages of one language family (1.4, in Native America Fascicle One), he did so because he (and his staff) failed to read critically the Horatio Hale word list published in the first half of the 19th century which shows no cognates between Cayuse and Molale. This error of omission in critical reading has been continued for over a century, from the 1840's to the 1960's when Bruce Rigsby discovered the error. Powell and his associates are to be credited collectively with having established most of the language families of North America. The BAE staff did the work; Major Powell made the decisions.

The impact of the Powell classification derives from three historical facts: (1) the map, as indicated above; (2) the fact that Boas kept himself (and those of his students who would heed him) within the confines of the language family scope in order to provide a cut-off point or a frame of reference to test empirically the thesis that admitted samenesses beyond this scope reflect diffusion in areal linguistics rather than a deeper time depth in phylum linguistics (*vide* his 1911 *Introduction* to the BAE Handbook of American Indian languages, and his 1917 *Introductory*, launching IJAL); (3) the predilection of a few workers in a few language families (Siouan, Algonquian, Athapascan, Uto-Aztecan and Salish) for comparative method work analogous to that possible in Old World language families (e.g. Indo-European and Semitic and Sinitic); but reconstructions in the latter can be checked against older languages preserved in writing, while reconstructions in American Indian language families cannot. Confidence in reconstructing language families among unwritten languages, without benefit of confirmation from older written languages, was increased and diffused after the demonstrations of reliability by Bloomfield and by Sapir who postulated the existence of expectable morphs in the Algonquian family and in the Athapascan family, respectively — morphs which were subsequently found to exist in the shape postulated when further field work was undertaken.

Had this sort of attestation been extended from five language families to all fifty language families, critical attention would have been directed to the subrelationships within each family. But this aspect of the task — an aspect that arouses endless controversy in Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian) linguistics — is only now beginning to arouse Americanist interest. For example, Bloomfield blandly accepted Michelson's picture of subrelationship among the Algonquian languages in terms of an Eastern-Central branch, on the one hand, and three divergent western branches (Arapaho, Blackfoot, and Cheyenne) on the other hand — without testing this scheme of brachiation in terms of shared innovations. Since there was no challenge at the time, there was no controversy over the matter. What Bloomfield did attest was that the languages in the Algonquian family could be reconstructed into a proto-language on the basis of relatively few daughter languages in the central branch, and contemporary and following workers were able to show that the reflexes in some other language spoken in the east (as Delaware) or in the west (as Arapaho) could be accounted for well enough from Bloomfield's reconstruction, requiring at most an additional consonant cluster or two. This kind of attestation is widely accepted as formal proof — but nothing more.

Something new — something more than formal proof — seemed then obtainable. Interfamily connections were discovered, sometimes showing cognacy across the whole continent. Such discoveries were widely accepted as revolutionary discoveries. How to begin such a revolution was obvious — simply find some few samenesses between language families or language isolates in a same general area, and postulate ultimate genetic relationship among them. This is what Kroeber and Dixon did for California, and what others did for areas extending from California to British Columbia. Sapir did no more than the others when he connected Tlingit and Haida with the Athapascan family in order to postulate Na-Dene, then called a superstock; and all the revolutionaries cooperated in connecting the micro-superstocks of one general area with those of adjacent areas (as California Penutian with Oregon Penutian, with Plateau Penutian) into a Penutian macro-superstock or phylum.

Sapir was regardedasthe chief revolutionary because he dared to connect language isolates and language families found in quite non-adjacent areas — e.g. his spectacular discovery that the Algonquian family of the east was ultimately related to two single languages in California, Wiyot and Yurok.

This is how the revolution began. How to end such a revolution as that reflected in the map made after Powell's — the colored wall map mentioned above that was published by the American Ethnological Society in 1944 — was far from obvious. The compilers of the second wall map realized, before they made their map, that Whorf had expanded one of Sapir's phyla to include more than Sapir had included for that phylum (which then included additional language familieis and language isolates in Mexico); according to Trager (op. cit. p. 188):

"The example I have just cited illustrates also my principal dissent from the Voegelins' classification. Whorf established, to the satisfaction of those who saw his material, that the grouping of Penutian, Sahaptian, Azteco-Tanoan, Zuni, Kiowa, probably Mayan and Totonac, and possibly Tunican, as stocks constituting a phylum which he called Macro-Penutian, was at least as good as the Algonkian-Mosan (Algonkian-Wakashan) or Na-Dene groupings of Sapir."

Here we must appeal to the Zeitgeist. The second comprehensive map — the one that followed Powell's — was compiled when Americanists had temporarily shifted their interest to languages relevant to World War II activities, which did not include American Indian languages. It was the languages themselves rather than their classification that Americanists wished to return to. Their appetites were sharpened for renewed analysis — for time to consolidate as far as Sapir had gone — before moving beyond Sapir. Hence, the decision to have the 1944 map reflect consensus up to (but not beyond) Sapir.

The third comprehensive map is now in preparation. It will reflect the consensus obtained among some thirty Americanists meeting in a conference on the Classification of American Indian languages held at the 1964 Linguistic Institute at Indiana University, twenty years after the second comprehensive map was made.

The third map will differ little from the first (1891) and second (1944) maps in respect to Eskimo-Aleut; it will merely indicate the area in northeast Asia where the Chukchi-Kamchatkan family is located, and show in the legend to the map that there is interfamily connection between the Eskimo-Aleut and Chukchi-Kamchatkan families, since both beong to the same phylum.

The third map will not differ essentially from the second map in respect to Na-Dene. But it will clarify the composition of this phylum (one language family, Athapascan, and two language isolates, Tlingit and Haida, of which the former shows more cognancy with the language family in the phylum than does the latter); and it will classify Eyak as being a language in the Athapascan family, rather than a language isolate.

Without subdivision into California, Oregon, or Plateau Penutian, the third map will show for the Penutian phylum many language families (Sahaptin, Coos, Yakonan, Kalapuya, Wintun, Miwok, Maidu, Yokuts, Chinook), as well as many associated language isolates (Cayuse, Molale, Klamath-Modoc, Takelma, Tsimshian and Zuni), as well as other Penutian families and isolates found in Mexico and Mesoamerica. So also, the third map will not differ from the second in Aztec-Tanoan, except for the exclusion of Zuni from this phylum.

Since Eskimo-Aleut, Na-Dene, Aztec-Tanoan, and Penutian appear for the most part unchanged from the second to the projected third map, more than half of the major cognate language groups (phyla) are to be mapped much as they were mapped in 1944. The remaining phyla are to be drastically revised, appearing on the third map as a Hokan phylum and a Macro-Siouan phylum (but abandoning Hokan-Siouan); and as a Macro-Algonquian phylum (but abandoning Algonkin-Wakashan); and, for the rest, as left-over language families and language isolates.

The projected third map will show for the Hokan phylum a half dozen language families (Palaihnihan, Yana, Pomo, Yuman, Salinan, Chumashan), and possibly others found in Mexico, together with language isolates, some of which are more closely associated with one than another of the language families in the Hokan phylum (e.g. Karok, Chimariko, Washo, Seri).

The third map will show for the Macro-Siouan phylum two language isolates and three language families. The interfamily connections between one (Caddoan) and the other two are less certain than the interfamily connections between the other two (Iroquoian and Siouan). As a language isolate, Catawba is relatively closer to the Siouan family than to the other families. The same might be said of Yuchi, but in a different sense. Yuchi is dubiously included as a language isolate in this particular phylum, from the merest traces of possible cognacy with the Siouan family.

The third map will show that the Macro-Algonquian phylum includes two language families (Algonquian and Muskogean) and many language isolates. Of the latter, two (Wiyot and Yurok) are more closely related to one of the language families (Algonquian) than are the remaining language isolates in this phylum. The relative remoteness of the remaining language isolates (Natchez, Chitimacha, Atakapa, Tunica, Tonkawa) — to each other and to the two language families of this phylum — is noted below in our final summarizing list.

Four language families (Salish, Wakashan, Yuki and Chimakuan) and a few language isolates (Keres, Karankawa, Kutenai, and the extinct Beothuk) appear in our summarizing list, below, as left-overs. There is no apparent evidence that they are related to each other in phylum linguistics, nor to any of the language families or language isolates to be mapped either as the old phyla (Eskimo-Aleut, Na-Dene, Penutian, Aztec-Tanoan), or as the revised phyla (Macro-Siouan, Hokan, Macro-Algonquian).

The information to be displayed on the new wall map is summarized below in terms of lists, with cross-references to lists already given of American Indian languages north of Mexico (1.4, in Native America Fascicle One), and of those in Latin America (1.5, above).

Before turning to our final summary list, we review some aspects of the methodology and terminology which lie behind the work here summarized. In historical perspective, two co-traditions can be differentiated in methodology, as well as in terminology. Methodologically, the scope of Powell continues in the Boas and Bloomfield tradition (e.g. in the work of Hockett, Hale and the Voegelins); that of Sapir continues in the work of many modern scholars (e.g. Haas and Swadesh and Greenberg). The former tradition goes no farther in reconstruction than what is permitted by cognates to attest a full phonemic inventory for a proto-language; the latter supplements the comparative method with 'mass comparisons' as well as with restricted lexical sampling, as in glotto-chronology. Both co-traditions would accept some such progressively differentiating typology for languages and dialects as the following:

(1) IMMEDIATELY RELATED (languages so similar that a speaker of L_1 can learn L_2 shortly after coming in contact with L_2, thereby raising the question as to whether L_1 and L_2 are different languages or different dialects of the same language, since the language barrier between them is temporary — e.g. in Polynesia, generally, as well as in the Pai group (consisting of Havasupai, Walapai, Yavapai), and among some Apachean languages in the Southwest);

(2) CLOSELY RELATED (languages within the same branch of a language family, as English and German, which are however separated by a solid language barrier, so that, though cognates between the two might be observable by inspection, an average speaker of L_1 could not learn L_2 shortly after coming in contact with L_2);

(3) DISTANTLY RELATED (languages in two different branches of the same language family, as English and Albanian, which are separated by a solid language barrier, and in addition share cognates which are generally not observable by inspection but are demonstrable in comparative method work);

(4) REMOTELY RELATED (languages in two different language family, which can be shown to be ultimately related by virtue of belonging to the same phylum — e.g. Hopi in the Uto-Aztecan family and Arizona Tewa in the Tanoan family, but both in the Aztec-Tanoan phylum).

Exemplars of the second co-tradition enjoy working in the rarified atmosphere of phylum linguistics, which begins with (4) above; exemplars of the first co-tradition confine their attention to (1) (2) and (3) kinds of relationship, and question whether historical connections of the more remote kind are accessible to the same comparative methodology as that which is applicable to languages which are immediately, closely, or distantly related.

There are two ways of viewing the difference between a language family and a phylum — (a) as a discontinuity in the statistical sense, with the break between the two expressable in operational terms; and (b) as a continuum, expressable in hierarchical terms. We use 'cognate language group' as a cover term for two or more remotely related languages in phylum linquistics, as well as for two or more languages in a language family closely enough related so as to be reconstructable in the comparative method sense.

Enough apparent cognates are available in phylum linguistics to put the burden of explanation on anyone who is skeptical of the genetic relationship between L_1 and L_2 . . . If two such languages are not related, how would one account for the apparent cognates that link L_1 and L_2? Density of cognates varies by definition: fewer cognates link L_1 and L_2 that are in the same phylum but in different families than those which link L_1 and L_2 that are in the same family; and the consequence of this in operational methodology is testable — a discontinuity between phylum cognate density and language family cognate density. Enough apparent cognates are available in languages classified as belonging to the same language family to permit the reconstruction of a parental phonemic system, for example, which shows as many contrasts as are shown in some of the descended daughter languages in the same family. Cognates attesting a language family are demonstrated (given formal proof) by the comparative method. In phylum linguistics, on the other hand, cognates are postulated, but are not given formal proof (because available apparent cognates are too sparse to permit full reconstruction rather than because the method of formal proof is unapplied). This is view (a), as identified above.

According to view (b), it is possible to detect a gradual continuum between the most remote or distant connections in any 'cognate language group' (phylum) and the connections that are immediately obvious in the first investigations of a 'cognate language group' (language family or even branch within a family). Gradations from the most remotely related or most comprehensive classifications of American Indian languages (macro-phyla) through more closely related or less comprehensive subclassifications (phyla, micro-phyla, stock, order, family, branch) are in this view, presented as a hierarchy. Terminological proportions then arise, since a branch of a language family (as Sonoran within the Uto-Aztecan family) is to the language family (as a whole) as a language family is to a phylum (as a whole). Controversy is then largely concerned with arguing where an agreed-upon genetic relationship should be placed in the hierarchy. Our objection to finely graded steps in a family tree model is not an objection to the model, as such, but to the tendency to grade more finely than the information warrants.

In view (b), complex hierarchical gradations are detectable; in view (a), one simple family-phylum discontinuity is testable. This way of stating the matter is in the direction of the growing appreciation (in linguistics and in anthropology) that views (b) and (a) — far from standing in a contradictory relationship to one other — merely represent two different strategies for programming research. Research programs which come to focus in phylum linguistics favor looking at their problem in terms of view (b); those which come to focus in comparative method work that does not go beyond the language family favor view (a).

This growing appreciation of the scientific validity of both views, carefully distinguished above, is now replacing an older and wholly misleading partisanship. In general, anthropologists welcomed phylum linguistics because it gave them new historical perspective (and they rejected comparative method linguistics within a known language family because nothing beyond what was anthropologically known seemed to emerge). In general, linguists rejected phylum linguistics as 'unsound'; they sometimes regarded Americanist comparative work as 'unsound', for the most part, under the assumption that Americanists were concerned primarily with phylum linguistics. This is simply not true. Both of the views distinguished above have been representative of Americanist research ever since the days of Sapir; and Sapir himself sometimes compared languages within families and at other times worked in phylum linguistics (from Na-Dene to Hokan-Siouan). Bloomfield, to be sure, confined himself to comparing languages within one or another family, as Indo-European or Algonquian. Some Americanists today follow Sapir's example; and some follow Bloomfield's example. The Sapir-Bloomfield influence is about equally divided in the modern linguistic world; if it were exactly so divided, the consequence would be that less research would be on-going today in phylum linguistics than in comparative method linguistics confined to language families. This is computed by assuming that an anthropological linguist in the Sapir tradition will devote only half his comparative research time to phylum linguistics, while his opposite in the Bloomfield tradition will devote none of his comparative research time to phylum linguistics; accordingly phylum linguistics will receive one fourth of the sum of all comparative research attention (one half of one tradition versus three halves of both the traditions). For a vivid example of our assumption that this is, in fact, the true emphasis in Americanist work, see the contents of the July, 1965, issue of IJAL which shows one paper devoted to phylum linguistics (by Swadesh) as against four papers devoted to comparative work within the Algonquian family or within the Uto-Aztecan family.

There is another reason for the lesser emphasis that Americanists give to phylum linguistics; this reason can be expressed in a not often stated and rather new hypothesis. Despite the feasibility of comparing one language (Taos) in one language family with $L_2 \ldots L_n$ in another language family (Uto-Aztecan), and thereby discovering a language phylum (Aztec-Tanoan), the new hypothesis holds that phylum linguistics is better advanced by postponing such frontal attack until after the proto phonology, at least, of each language family is reconstructed by the comparative method. This hypothesis makes phylum linguistics dependent on phase I (comparative work within separate language families), and thereby establishes phylum linguistics as phase II of comparative method linguistics.

As will be seen in the following brief history of research on Penutian, it turned out to be difficult enough to recognize even the simple operational difference between phylum and family.

The phylum nature of California Penutian was masked when first presented (1913): Miwok, Wintun, Maidu, Yokuts (and the already extinct Coastanoan) were discussed as though each language name stood for a separate language and that they together constituted the daughter languages of one parent language called Penutian. The name of a language sometimes coincides with the name of a family as 'Maidu' for the Maidu language and also for the Maidu family which includes more than one language; so also, as a family name, Yokuts is a cover term for several languages which bear so many surface similarities that they are observable by inspection. Cognacy within the California Penutian phylum was not so readily observable. It was in the second decade of this century that Kroeber and Dixon began to find traces of the connection between its constituent language families. And it was mostly in the next decade that further traces of more distant connection were found; after that, any inclination to regard California Penutian as a compact language family was replaced by a realization that Penutian was a far flung phylum, extending south from a language isolate in Canada (Tsimshian). Kroeber recognized Alsea as a language in Frachtenberg's Oregon Penutian first; then Sapir included Tsimshian in a cognate language group with Chinook and Takelma, as well with other languages in Washington and Oregon. Penutian connections centered in California — where they were first discerned. Traces of phylum affiliation were found as far north as Canada, and as far south as southern Mexico where the Mixe-Zoque language family was taken as a representative of Mexican Penutian by Sapir.

Sporadic examination of other representatives of Penutian in Latin America have been made in every decade since — in 1930 (Freeland), in 1945 (Whorf-Trager), and in 1956 (Swadesh); most interesting of all was Whorf's inclusion of the Mayan family in the Penutian phylum. Intensive examination of California language families in the Penutian phylum — largely by Shipley and Pitkin —

continues into the present decade as one consequence of the Survey of California Indian Languages launched by Mary Haas and Murray Emeneau in the last decade. Intensive rather than extensive comparison of a language isolate (Tsimshian) and a language family (Chinook) — among others having Penutian connections north of California — is being made by Dell Hymes who is not dismayed by the work of others who seek to connect the Penutian phylum with the Algonquian family; but who concludes that the level of productive work in the Penutian phylum is best reached when one keeps within the boundaries of that phylum as postulated by Sapir.

In summary, Sapir crystalized the Penutian phylum. Some find it profitable to work within the boundaries circumscribed by him. But others who work in phylum linguistics, notably Sapir's own students — Stanley Newman, Mary Haas, and Morris Swadesh — are not inhibited; they continue to explore the possibility of adding a language isolate or language family to Penutian, or combining other phyla with the Penutian phylum.

Exploratory work in phylum linguistics generally is facilitated when two or more language families are examined for possible inclusion in one 'cognate language group'. Exploration is most difficult when a single language like Zuni or Kutenai is considered for inclusion in one or another phylum. Mary Haas has extended the usual usage of a genetically isolated language or language isolate (like Basque in Europe, which no one has successfully related to any other language or language family) to a single language like Zuni which, though not a member of any other language family, has always been examined for possible remote relationships in phylum linguistics. This usage of 'language isolate' appeared first in a paper by Mary Haas (Is Kutenai related to Algonkian?), at the Edmonton conference in the summer of 1964, and is to appear in a volume edited by Harry Hoijer. The term 'language isolate' caught on immediately at the Edmonton conference, and has been widely used in Mary Haas' sense in discussions of phylum linguistics at the subsequent Conferences on American Indian languages.

For example, the level of confidence in respect to a proposed cognate language group is high when the proposal includes interfamily connections, as in what Shipley calls the Penutian kernel (five language families: Wintu, Maidu, Yokuts, Miwok-Coastanoan and Sahaptin). The level of confidence is less high when the proposed cognate language group is set up as a phylum which includes a nearby language isolate, as Takelma. And the level of confidence approximates zero in respect to a proposal for including a geographically distant language isolate like Zuni in a phylum like Penutian.

The on-going revision, reflected below, is of course based on new information, gathered since Sapir's day, but also on a reconsideration of terms fundamental to the classification, including 'cognate language group', with a testable distinction between 'language phylum' and 'language family', on the one hand, and between 'language family' and 'language isolate' on the other hand. We do not repeat the names of languages that belong to language families specified in the following final summary, since this information is already given (in 1.4 of Native America Fascicle One, and under 1.5, above). The only language names mentioned in the following list are those of language isolates which are, in a special sense, the sole representatives of language families. The use of 'language isolate', in the sense identified above, turns out to be crucial for cartographic representation on the third map. Our problem is to show on that map that phylum I (in the summary list which follows) has as its constituents two language families (Ia and Ib); next, to show that the constituents of phylum II are a language family (IIa) and two language isolates (IIb and IIc); and to show that the constituents of phylum III are two language families (IIIa and IIId) and seven language isolates (IIIb, IIIc, IIIe, IIIf, IIIg, IIIh, IIIi); and that the constituents of phylum IV are three language families (IVa, IVc, IVd) and two language isolates (IVb and IVe); and that the constituents of phylum V are ten language families (Va, Vc, Vd, Ve, Vf, Vi, Vk, Vl, Vp, Vq) and seven language isolates (Vb, Vg, Vh, Vj, Vm, Vn, Vo); and that the constituents of phylum VI are nine language families (VIa, VIb, VIc, VId, VIf, VIi, VIj, VIl, VIm) and six language isolates (VIe, VIg, VIh, VIk, VIn, VIo); and that the constituents of phylum VII are two language families (VIIa and VIIb). Finally, there remain as left-oevers, four language families (VIIIb, VIIIf, VIIIg, VIIIh) and five language isolates (VIIIa, VIIIc, VIIId, VIIIe, VIIIi).

ON-GOING REVISION OF
AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE CLASSIFICATION

I. AMERICAN ARCTIC-PALEOSIBERIAN PHYLUM (= Sapir's Eskimo-Aleut family to which at least one Paleosiberian family seems to be related)

Ia Eskimo-Aleut language family (as in Sapir's usage)

Ib Chukchi-Kamchtkan language family

II. NA-DENE PHYLUM (= Sapir's Na-Dene)

IIa Athapascan language family (= Sapir's Athabascan family plus Eyak as a divergent language in the family)

IIb Tlingit language isolate (greater cognancy than Haida with the Athapascan family)

IIc Haida language isolate

III. MACRO-ALGONQUIAN PHYLUM (= part of Sapir's Algonquian-Wakashan phylum plus a language family and several isolates previously assigned to the Hokan-Siouan phylum)

IIIa Algonquian language family, the only family in the Algic affiliation, which includes Yurok and Wiyot.

IIIb Yurok language isolate (Yurok and Wiyot are related to Algonquian as Tlingit and Haida are to Athapascan)

IIIc Wiyot language isolate (the neighboring Wiyot and Yurok languages do not constitute a language family)

IIId Muskogean language family (= family in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan)

IIIe Natchez language isolate (= language in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan)

IIIf *Atakapa (now extinct; classified formerly in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan)

IIIg Chitimacha language isolate (= language in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan)

IIIh Tunica language isolate (possibly extinct, classified formerly in Hokan-

Siouan)

IIIi *Tonkawa (now extinct; classified formerly in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan; now reclassified but dubiously so)

IV. MACRO-SIOUAN PHYLUM (= part of Sapir's Hokan-Siouan)

IVa Siouan language family (interfamily connections with Iroquoian)

IVb Catawba language isolate (closer to the Siouan family than to other families or language isolates in Macro-Siouan; specialists have wavered in classifying Catawba first as an isolate, then as a divergent member of the Siouan family, and then again as a language isolate)

IVc Iroquoian language family (interfamily connections with Siouan)

IVd Caddoan language family (interfamily connections with other families in Macro-Siouan phylum await closer examination)

IVe Yuchi language isolate (analagous to the remote relationship of the Haida isolate to the Athapascan family; Yuchi shows traces of cognacy with the Siouan family and with the Catawba language isolate)

V. HOKAN PHYLUM (= part of Sapir's Hokan-Siouan)

Va Yuman language family (interfamily connections with Pomo postulated)

Vb Seri language isolate (affiliations with the Yuman family perhaps analogous to the relatively close affiliation of the Catawba isolate to the Siouan family)

Vc Pomo language family (interfamily connections with Yuman in the Hokan

	phylum)
Vd	Palaihnihan language family (= the Achumawi-Atsugewi part of Sapir's Shasta-Achumawi)
Ve	Shastan language family (interfamily connection with Palaihnihan — minimized by Olmsted)
Vf	*Yanan language family
Vg	Chimariko language isolate
Vh	Washo language isolate
Vi	*Salinan language family
Vj	Karok language isolate
Vk	*Chumashan language family (with reservations on phylum affiliations in Hokan)
Vl	*Comecrudan language family (with reservations on phylum affiliations in Hokan)
Vm	Coahuiltecan language isolate (with reservations on phylum affiliations in Hokan)
Vn	*Esselen language isolate (strong reservations on evidence for phylum affiliations of Esselen in Hokan)
Vo	Jicaque language isolate
Vp	Tlapanecan (Subtiaba-Tlapanec) language family (inter-family connections with Tequistlatecan postulated)
Vq	Tequistlatecan language family (interfamily connections with Yuman postulated)

VI. PENUTIAN PHYLUM (= Sapir's Penutian for the most part; Sapir's Zuni, reclassified from Aztec-Tanoan to Penutian)

VIa Yokuts language family

VIb Maidu language family

VIc Wintun language family (there is a special relationship between Northern Wintun and Southern Miwok which may be as close as between Northern and Southern Wintun)

VId Miwok-Costanoan language family (the special relationship linking branches of Wintun and Miwok is such as to suggest that the language family lines between Wintun and Miwok-Costanoan have been incorrectly drawn)

VIe Klamath-Modoc language isolate

VIf Sahaptin-Nez Perce language family

VIg *Cayuse language isolate

VIh *Molale language isolate (rather than a sister language, with *Cayuse, in the non-existent Waiilatpuan family; see Native America Fascicle One, pp. 120-121)

VIi Coos language family

VIj Yakonan language family (the members of this family, Alsea and Siuslaw-Lower Umpqua, have sometimes been considered as two language isolates)

VIk Takelma language isolate (perhaps with closer affiliations to the Kalapuya family than to other families in the Penutian phylum)

VIl Kalapuya language family

VIm Chinookan language family

VIn Tsimshian language isolate (with reservations on phylum affiliations in Penutian)

VIo Zuni language isolate (with reservation on phylum affiliation in Penutian)

VII. AZTEC-TANOAN PHYLUM (= Sapir's Aztec-Tanoan for the most part, but not including Zuni)

VIIa Kiowa-Tanoan language family (with Kiowa taken as a divergent member of the family, rather than as a language isolate in the phylum)

VIIb Uto-Aztecan language family

VIII. LANGUAGE ISOLATES AND FAMILIES WITH UNDETERMINED PHYLUM AFFILIATIONS (= members of Sapir's Hokan-Siouan or Algonquian-Wakashan phyla) NORTH OF MEXICO

VIIIa Keres language isolate (= language in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan phylum)

VIIIb Yuki language family (= family in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan phylum)

VIIIc *Beothuk language isolate (= language in Sapir's extended Algonquian family which included Yurok and Wiyot in one family rather than one phylum)

VIIId Kutenai language isolate (= language in Sapir's Algonquian-Wakashan phylum; remote connections with Algonquian family, with Salish family and with Wakashan family discussed)

VIIIe Karankawa language isolate (= language in Sapir's Hokan-Siouan phylum)

VIIIf Chimakuan language family (= family in Sapir's Algonquian-Wakashan phylum under the Mosan division)

VIIIg Salish language family (= family in Sapir's Algonquian-Wakashan phylum, under the Mosan division; recent discussion on possibility of Algonquian-Salish affiliations)

VIIIh Wakashan language family (= family in Sapir's Algonquian-Wakashan phylum, under Mosan division)

VIIIi *Timucua language isolate (= language questioningly included in Sapir's Hokan- Siouan phylum)

EXTENTION OF PENUTIAN PHYLUM VI
(in Mexico-Mesoamerica and Bolivia)

Mixe-Zoque (Zoquean) family

Mayan family, with two dozen languages subrelated in ten groups:

- Huastecan group
- Cholan group
- Teltalan group
- Chuh group
- Konjobalan group
- Motozintlec group
- Mamean group
- Quichean group
- Kekchian group
- Maya proper group

Chipaya-Uru family

Totonacan family

Huave language isolate

EXTENTION OF HOKAN PHYLUM V
(in Mexico-Mesoamerica)

Seri language isolate

Tequistlatecan family

Tlapanec (Subtiaba-Tlapanec, Supanecan) family

Jicaque language isolate

OTO-MANGUEAN PHYLUM IX
(in Mexico-Mesoamerica exclusively)

Manguean (Chorotegan) family

Otomian (Otomi-Pame) family

Popolocan family

Mixtecan family

Chinantecan family

Zapotecan family

UNAFFILIATED LANGUAGE ISOLATE
(in Mexico)

Tarascan

MACRO-CHIBCHAN PHYLUM X
(in Mesoamerica and South America)

Chibchan family (or phylum)

Misumalpan family

Paya language isolate

Xinca language isolate

Lenca language isolate

Waican family

Barbacoan family

Inter-Andine (Paez-Coconuco) family

Choco family

Warao (Guarauan) language isolate

Mura language isolate

Manatawi language isolate

Jiraran family

Yunca-Puruhan phylum

Andakí language isolate

Itonama language isolate

Atacameño language isolate

GE-PANO-CARIB MACRO-PHYLUM XI
(in South America)

Ge family

Caingang family

Camacan family

Machacali family

Puri (Coroado) family

Chiquito family

Patacho language isolate

Malali language isolate

Coropo language isolate

Botocudo family

Guato language isolate

Fulnio language isolate

Oti language isolate

Bororo family

Caraja family

Tacana-Pano family

Moseten family

Mataco family

Lule-Vilela-Charrua family

Mascoy language isolate

Nambicuara family

Huarpe family

Carib family

Peba-Yaguan family

Witotoan family

Curura language isolate

Taruma language isolate

ANDEAN-EQUATORIAL MACRO-PHYLUM XII
(in South America)

Chon (Ona-Chon) family

Araucanian language isolate

Alacaluf language isolate

Yahgan language isolate

Puelche language isolate

Quechumaran phylum

Zaparoan family

Cahuapanan family

Xibito-Cholon family

Sec language isolate

Catacao language isolate

Leco language isolate

Culle language isolate

Colan language isolate

Simacu family or language isolate

Jivaro language isolate

Candoshi language isolate

Esmeralda language isolate

Yaruro language isolate

Cofan language isolate

Tucanoan (Betoyan) family

Catuquina (Catukina) family

Tucuna language isolate

Muniche language isolate

Auaque language isolate

Caliana language isolate

Macu language isolate

Yuri language isolate

Caninchana language isolate

Movima language isolate

Puinave family

Arawakan family

Tupi (Tupi-Guarani) family

Timote family

Cariri family

Moçoa family

Salivan family

Zamucoan family

Guahibo-Pamigua family

Yuracarean family

Tuyuneri language isolate

Otomaca-Taparita language isolate

Cayuvava language isolate

Trumai language isolate

XIII. SOUTH AMERICAN LANGUAGES WITH UNDETERMINED PHYLUM AFFILIATIONS

Aricapu

Baena

Juma

Natu

Hishkaryana

The Following Abbreviations Will Be Used

AA	American Anthropologist
ACLS	American Council of Learned Societies
AES-P	American Ethnological Society, Publication
AL	Anthropological Linguistics
APS-P	American Philosophical Society, Proceedings
APS-T	American Philosophical Society, Transactions
BAE-B	Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin
BAE-R	Bureau of American Ethnology, Report
CU	Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology
IJAL	International Journal of American Linguistics
IUPAL	Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics
JAF	Journal of American Folklore
JSAP	Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris
Lg	Language
RCPAFL	Research Center Publications in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics
SJA	Southwestern Journal of Anthropology
SIL	Studies in Linguistics
TCLP	Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague
UMPL	University of Michigan Publications, Linguistics
UCPAAE	University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology
UCPL	University of California Publications in Linguistics
VFPA	Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology
WDWLS	William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series

CONTENTS

NATIVE AMERICA FASCICLE TWO

1.5. Unified list of American Indian languages aboriginal to Latin America 2

1.6. Classifications of American Indian languages 121